The Southern Speech Journal

VOLUME XIX | MAY, 1954 | NUMBER 4

PREPARING MEN TO SPEAK FOR GOD—FOREWORD TO A STUDY IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

CHARLES A. MCGLON*

Today there is considerable emphasis in the United States of America upon good speech for preachers. Church members listen to the speech of their religious leaders and compare it with what they hear in the courtroom, in the lecture hall, in the theatre, and over the radio. Not altogether satisfied with the state of oral address in religious work, many religious congregations have begun to demand that their ministers become as effective as the outstanding speakers of other professional groups. Contemporary churchmen also have indicated their realization of the need for improvement of religious address in America.

Laymen and preachers alike recognize that good speech for preachers merits special attention since it is necessary in all phases of ministerial service. It is basic to good preaching; for speech is a part of preaching, and preaching is a kind of speaking. But preaching is only one kind of religious speaking; many pastoral duties outside the pulpit also require effective communication through the spoken word. Especially noteworthy are the pastor's use of the mother tongue to bring persons to Christ and to a commitment to the will of God as disclosed in Christ; to help parents build Christian homes and provide Christian nurture for their children; to reach the unchurched children and adults for the ministries of religion; to train lay leadership; to help create conditions in society where Christian ideals might be lived more completely; and to give moral and material support to minority groups by conducting interracial and interfaith services and by directing special classes for re-

*Professor of Speech, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; Former President of the Southern Speech Association; Chairman of the Study Committee on Problems in the Teaching of Speech to Preachers, The Speech Association of America.

ligious study and discussion.[1] Thus, for a rich ministry of all-inclusive Christian service, the religious leader is dependent at least in part upon good speech. It is important, therefore, to study what has been taught in the curriculum of speech for preachers, and to determine what might be taught with profit to students who are preparing to serve God and man by means of the spoken word.

The Nature of the Study

Widespread concern for the training which theological students receive for their ministry of speaking has been evident periodically in the United States, but today it is particularly noticeable among the members of evangelical Christian groups who believe that good speech can be taught and that speech education rightly belongs in the theological curriculum. Improvement-minded religious and educational leaders of these and all other denominations might seriously consider such basic problems as (1) the *objectives* of ministerial speech and of ministerial speech education, (2) the *organization* of agencies or means for producing good speech for preachers, and (3) the *instruction* which might be employed to achieve the designated objectives. Furthermore, the leaders, to establish a reliable background for their thinking, might profitably study the experiences of their predecessors to find at least some answers to specific questions which relate directly to the problems listed above. Such questions might be: What type of preacher did leaders of religious groups in the past want? What type of curriculum did they propose in order to secure the kind of preacher they wanted? What schools were established? What departments were organized? What titles or professorships were designated for the teachers of speech? What courses were offered? What did courses in speech for preachers embody? How did the content contribute to the fulfilling of the objectives? What were the actual sources of the content and methods? Furthermore, who were the important teachers of speech for preachers; and, what efforts did they make to extend the speech education of ministerial students beyond the classrooms of the seminaries?

Since the educators have not found altogether satisfying answers

---

[1]Hugh Hartshorne and Milton C. Froyd, *Theological Education in the Northern Baptist Convention* (Philadelphia, 1945), 21-53.

to the foregoing questions, it is the purpose of this study[2] to attempt to do so, by tracing the development of the teaching of speech for preachers in certain theological seminaries. A selection of educational institutions was made necessary by the fact that there were in the United States 1943 one hundred eighty-nine theological seminaries or divinity schools that were supported wholly or in part by sixty-four different evangelical or Protestant Christian groups and fifteen non-denominational or interdenominational bodies.[3] To assure the possibility of a thorough study, therefore, the denomination of Christians called Baptist and thirteen seminaries affiliated with it were selected for study. The choice of the Baptists, as one of the largest religious groups in the United States, further assured the study of a sort of substantial representation as regards American life; and the choice of the schools as definitely recognized theological seminaries automatically eliminated the usual departments of theology in colleges and universities, seminaries not affiliated with either the Northern or the Southern conventions in 1943, and the seminaries that were organized or operated especially for non-English speaking students.

Listed under their present names, the selected seminaries, together with their locations and dates of establishment, are as follows: Colgate-Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, New York (Colgate, 1819; Rochester, 1850); Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts (Andover: Congregational, 1808; Newton: Baptist, 1825); Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky (1859); The Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois (1866); Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania (1867); Central Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Kansas (1901); Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, Berkeley, California (1904); Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas (1908); Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois (1913); New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana (1918); and Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1925).

The schools having been selected, a limitation of the problem as

[2]Charles A. McGlon, "Speech Education in Baptist Theological Seminaries in the United States of America, 1819-1943," Unpublished (microfilmed) Ph. D. dissertation (Columbia University, 1951), xi, 406, lxvi.

[3]Benson Y. Landis, *Yearbook of American Churches* (Lebanon, Pennsylvania, 1945), 178.

to chronology seemed advisable. The dates 1819 and 1943 were selected as marking a period that was initiated during the formative years of the theological seminary movement in America and that stretched to the time when the program for training seminary students for a ministry in the chaplaincy of the Armed Services of the United States was accelerated. Because of the latter fact, limiting the study to 1943 was not only an act of convenience but one of acknowledging the influence which World War II had upon speech education in theological schools.

Thus delimited as described above, the problem of this study may be defined as an historical study of speech education in theological seminaries of the Baptist denomination in the United States of America, 1819-1943. It is an investigation of the theory and practice of a large body of evangelical Christians to teach ministerial students to speak and to preach effectively. It is a survey and analysis of the curriculum-making which was undertaken over a period of one hundred twenty-four years to prepare theological students in special schools for a forceful ministry of religious utterance and leadership. It is at least a partial answer to the question of what the faculties in certain theological seminaries did to produce good speech for preachers.

The Sources of the Study

The primary sources used in this study were the annual reports of the educational groups which established the seminaries, the minutes of the meetings of the faculties and of the trustees, and the personal reports which were written annually by certain faculty members regarding their classroom teaching and extraclass activities. Additional information about certain faculty instruction and activity came from the minutes of the Baptist Faculties Union, as well as from the annual reports of the larger official bodies of the denomination. Of value also were the lecture-notes, sermons, and articles by faculty members. Especially helpful were the sermons on the education of ministers and on the minister's task that were prepared for ordinations and other special occasions. Also, there were the textbooks written, used, or recommended by the professors. For descriptions of courses and for statements by the teachers regarding the objectives of departments and courses, the seminary

catalogues were consulted as primary sources. The latter materials, not always accepted as altogether reliable information, were verified by cross-references to the other sources, particularly to the denominational periodicals which contained not only many of the annual reports of the education societies and of the faculties, but also much first hand information about student life and the nature and content of seminary instruction. Further important primary sources were the minutes and record books of the religious and rhetorical societies which seminary students organized and conducted for their own benefit. Student diaries, though not particularly enlightening, supplied some information regarding classroom instruction and the personality and techniques of certain teachers. More valuable, however, were certain student notebooks which included the class lectures that the students of the early period, as was the custom, copied word for word.

The few sources which were used as secondary in this study included the histories of general education, of Baptists, and of theological education. Others were the theses and dissertations on homiletical theory and practice and on certain other aspects of speech education which pertained to the problem of this investigation. Certain biographical materials about the teachers in the seminaries were also consulted. For the most part, the latter data were used to relate developments in general education to developments in theological education.

The Procedure Followed in the Study

To collect the materials for this study, visits were made to the campuses of nine seminaries: Andover Newton, Eastern, Crozer, Southern, Southwestern, New Orleans, Chicago, Northern, and Central. Further visits were made to the important stores of Baptist materials found in the Samuel-Colgate Baptist Historical Collection at Colgate University, Hamilton, New York; in the American Baptist Historical Society, Chester, Pennsylvania; and in the historical collections of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and of the Southern Baptist Historical Society, Louisville, Kentucky. Moreover, the entire collection of materials on theological seminaries at Union Theological Seminary in New York City was examined carefully.

After a thorough study of the data or materials, it became apparent that there was only one remarkable change in the speech curriculum. Consequently, it seemed advisable to divide the study into two major sections. This change definitely occurred in 1879; it followed, then, that Part One became entitled "THE PREACHER IN THE EARLY PERIOD, 1819-1879: Teaching the Student Preacher to Proclaim the Gospel and to Teach the Word." By the same token, Part Two was identified as "THE MINISTER IN THE MODERN PERIOD, 1880-1943: Teaching the Student Minister to Speak with the People and to Supervise Church Affairs." Finally, on the basis of the relationships that became apparent and the conclusions that could be drawn, it seemed advisable to make certain recommendations for the improved development of speech education in theological seminaries.

It is hoped that certain values will accrue from this study of speech education in Baptist theological seminaries. (1) Tracing the steps in what has already been done to teach ministerial students to speak and to preach effectively should aid in improving the present curriculum in theological seminaries. Of course, this value would rest upon the assumption that a knowledge of past experiences in teaching should improve present instruction. (2) Analyzing the theory and practice of speech instruction in theological seminaries should aid in improving ministerial speech in general and preaching in particular, thus increasing the effectiveness of the pulpit in American life. This value likewise would rest upon an assumption: improved instruction in speech should produce improved speech. And (3) establishing the relationship between speech education and particular phases of theological education should be an important contribution to general education in America.

THE TERMS OF THE PROBLEM DEFINED

Three terms used in this investigation need definition and enlargement: speech education, theological seminaries, and the Baptist denomination. The definition of the latter term should include a brief description of Baptist beliefs and organization prior to 1819 in order to show the relationship between the development of the speech curriculum and the circumstances and the agencies which influenced it.

Speech Education

Andrew T. Weaver defined speech as *"a code made up of the visible and audible symbols which one person uses to stir up ideas and feelings in other persons without the use of any means other than voice and visible bodily action. Speech clearly includes, in addition to verbal language, tones, inflections, posture, and gesture."*[4] Weaver's concept of speech was enlarged upon by Thonssen and Scanlan, when they wrote that

> Speaking involves the three necessary elements of any potentially skillful activity: (1) determination of purpose; (2) selection of materials; and (3) the use of tools. Any art is essentially the effective adaptation of means to ends, and therefore all speaking is potentially an art. Skill implies three qualities in adapting the materials and tools to a given purpose: (1) effectiveness; (2) accuracy; and (3) ease. A moment's reflection will show that these are the principal qualities for which, consciously or unconsciously, we strive in speech. We want to be effective when we speak. This means simply that we want to accomplish the purpose for which we speak. We want some definite response from our listener: amusement, a better understanding of something, a particular action.[5]

Only recently has the term speech education come into general usage. In 1932, W. Arthur Cable published *A Program of Speech Education in a Democracy.* Therein he defined speech education as

> . . . everything connected with the acquisition of skill in the speech function (which is speech training) and everything relating to literary, critical, historical, scientific, corrective, and pedagogical aspects of the speech function (the knowledge portions of the field).[6]

In 1939, Sara M. Barber described a course in speech education as one which would "function in its biggest and broadest sense" to help a student achieve an

> 1. Understanding of speech as a form of social behavior with attendant responsibilities for the speaker, and obligations to the social group. 2. Understanding of speech as a form of personal behaviour with consequences that take on a life concern in the social, economic, and cultural life of the individual. 3. Ability to think clearly. 4. Improved use of the voice mechanism. 5. Improved use of spoken English. 6. Ability to express oneself lucidly and effectively.

---

[4]Andrew T. Weaver, *Speech Forms and Principles* (New York, 1942), 30-31.

[5]Lester Thonnsen and Ross Scanlan, *Speech Preparation and Delivery* (Philadelphia, 1942), 10.

[6]W. Arthur Cable, *A Program of Speech Education in a Democracy* (Boston, 1932), v.

7. Ability to give added significance to prose and poetry through oral interpretation (and) 8. (success in the) building of character, of personality, and of social and personal effectiveness.[7]

And in 1943 Ollie L. Backus pungently stated that "speech education should consist of the removal of defects, refinements in the mode of speaking, and mastery of the uses of speech in everyday living."[8]

In the present study, speech education denotes the instruction or training which was given students in speech principles, speech practice, and speech criticism with the objective of improving or increasing the powers of purposeful oral expression, aided by the use of the visible code, in private and in public. Speech education includes the basic aim, content, and techniques that have been taught in theological seminaries through courses in sacred rhetoric, logic, eloquence, the preparation and delivery of sermons, homiletics, oratory, elocution, vocal culture, expression, public speaking, speech, the English language, and certain phases of oral interpretation, dramatics, choral speaking, and radio; but speech education encompasses more than any one of the individual courses.

Theological Seminaries

Although theological education had its beginnings in Europe, the movement to establish theological seminaries was a relatively American activity. The early colleges in the United States, founded for the education of Christian ministers, eventually ceased to be theological schools because of the increased freedom of thought that developed among both faculties and students, and because of the admission of large numbers of students who were destined for pursuits other than the ministry but who needed "an Academical training."[9] Therefore, to meet the new need for a specialized theological education, religious leaders first adopted a system of private study and apprenticeship, by which experienced preachers accepted into their homes a limited number of able young ministers as personal charges.

[7] Sara M. Barber, *Speech Education* (Boston, 1939), xiii.

[8] Ollie M. Backus, *Speech in Education* (New York, 1943), viii.

[9] William G. Blaikie, *The Colleges and Theological Institutions of America* (Edinburgh, 1870), 15; also, Mark A. May, *The Education of American Ministers,* IV vols. (New York, 1934), III: 501-2.

The older preachers found their double duties of preaching and teaching exhausting. Consequently, some of those preachers who were most successful with theological students gradually gave up their pastoral work and devoted themselves to teaching.[10] To do so meant that they had to seek support for themselves as well as for their indigent students. Individual members and small groups within the churches, recognizing the value of the private theological schools thus established, began to contribute to the maintenance of them. With this support came the demand, either directly or indirectly stated, for a voice in determining the objectives and practices of the schools. Thus developed among Protestants and evangelical groups in America the special type of school known as the theological seminary.

Almost from the beginning of the seminary movement in America in the late 1770's, the idea prevailed that a major task of the schools is to insure the life of the religious groups which support them. The excepton to this fact might appear to be the non-denominational or interdenominational seminaries. However, even in the latter schools a stylized kind of Christian faith that is typical of the individual or the organization which controls them by direct financial aid or by the administration of accumulated funds is propagated. The important fact is that control by the supporting groups shows in the educational theories and practices of all the schools.[11] For this reason, it is impossible to study the teaching of speech without some attention to the nature of the schools in which speech was taught, and to the nature of the groups who organized and maintained the schools.

The Baptist Denomination

Baptist theological beliefs influenced Baptist plans of religious organization. In turn, Baptist religious beliefs and organizational forms influenced Baptist educational theories and practices. Especially did the Baptist concept of the ministry influence the nature

[10] S. W. Lynd, *Memoir of the Rev. William Staughton, D.D.* (Boston, 1834), 40-222.

[11] Board of Managers (of the New York Baptist Theological Seminary), "Minutes," MS. in the Samuel Colgate Collection (June 14, 1814), 36; and, Isaac G. Matthews, "The Function of the Seminary Classroom," *Crozer Theological Seminary Bulletin,* XII (October, 1920), 123-31.

of schools and of curricula which were developed for ministerial education. Specifically, the denomination's concept of the minister's task as being one largely of speaking influenced immeasurably the teaching of speech content and techniques in the seminaries.

Religious Beliefs

Baptists have never been in complete agreement either in their modes of thought or in their doctrinal beliefs. This fact is not surprising since the Baptist tradition, historically established at least by 1641 in England, has been to encourage the individual in his own religious expression. The belief in a personal religion (with its accompanying freedom of investigation, interpretation, and application of religious principles) has made unanimity among Baptists hardly possible.[12] Nevertheless, without having a creed that is recognized as authoritative or binding, and without having hierarchical bodies to press uniformity of doctrine or of practice upon the churches or the ministers, Baptists have molded for themselves a definite position in the realm of evangelical Christianity upon the basis of five cardinal principles. That is, Baptists generally are noted for their belief in the supreme authority of the Scriptures for religious faith and practice, the competency of the individual to deal for himself in things religious, the equality of Christ's disciples, the independence of the local church, and the propagation of religious liberty and the rights of conscience, which are made possible by the absolute separation of church and state.[13]

Organizational Form

In keeping with the spirit of the five cardinal principles, Baptist organization is exceedingly simple. Working through small, democratic, deliberative bodies and larger, representative, cooperative bodies, the denomination has endeavored to fulfill what it considers the New Testament commission of preaching, teaching, and healing. As the denomination has grown in numbers and has extended its

---

[12]Albert H. Newman, "Recent Changes in the Theology of Baptists," *American Journal of Theology*, X (October, 1906), 609; also, W. J. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Philadelphia, 1911), i-xii.

[13]E. J. Forrester, *The Baptist Position as to the Bible, the Church, and the Ordinances* (Baltimore, 1893), 1-23; and, Rufus W. Weaver, "Baptist Watchmen and the New Order," *Review and Expositor*, XLI (April, 1944), 123-34.

activities,[14] it has made use of the organizational forms of the local church, the associational meeting, the special society, the convention, and the world alliance.

Baptists have interpreted as congregational ,the form of churches described in the New Testament Scriptures; therefore, they have insisted that the local church should be constituted and allowed to function as an autonomous body of responsible, regenerated, immersed believers in Christ. They have determined that the business of each church should be so conducted that every member might speak and vote on all issues, the will of the majority determining the settlement of each problem. Furthermore, they have insisted that the local religious leader — whether referred to as preacher, minister, pastor, elder, or bishop — should be an elected servant of the congregation, who is in no sense would enjoy special privilege, or perform special religious duties except as directed by the congregation. Thus, Baptists have provided for succession in Christianity through the constituting of "New Testament churches" rather than through the sustenance of a hierarchy. At the same time, by the very nature of the relationship which they have established between the local church and its religious leader, they have made it necessary for the preacher, like most of the other leaders of the affairs of men, to hold his office primarily by his persuasive powers of speaking and by his ability to be a part of the group at the same time that he bears a delegated responsibility for the group.[15]

A type of cooperative organization which Baptists developed to promote Christian activities too great or too expensive for a single church to sponsor was *the associational meeting.* In no sense a system for ruling or regulating the churches as smaller religious bodies, the first associational meetings were conducted by messengers elected by the local churches of a given district or section of the country to consult about matters of Christian belief and practice that troubled the various groups. However, the chief objects of associational endeavor early became missionary and educational enterprises.

---

[14]Albert H. Newman, "History of Baptist Organization," *Review and Expositor,* VIII (July, 1911), 363-4; and, William O. Carver, "The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in the Growing of a Denomination," *ibid.,* XLIII (April, 1946), 131-49.

[15]J. M. Peck, "Baptists in the United States," *(American) Baptist Memorial,* III (July, 1844), 193-7; and, Edgar Y. Mullins, *Baptist Beliefs* (Louisville, 1921), 62-8.

For the latter purposes, funds were collected voluntarily from individuals and from churches to send missionaries to work on the expanding frontiers of the new nation; to acquire libraries of theological books difficult to secure from Europe; and to provide scholarships and supplies for worthy, indigent students who desired to study for the ministry.[16]

The third significant type of Baptist organization was *the special society,* usually a missionary society or an education society which was organized apart from the local church or the association. The object of this type of fellowship was two-fold. In the first place, Christian work that was considered needful in various communities sometimes lacked the initiating sponsorship of a church or an association. In the next place, extra funds were many times needed to support missionary or educational projects already undertaken by a church or an association. To supply these needs, special missionary and education societies were organized by groups of men, women, and children in many places over the country. Thus, the support for early Baptist theological education did not come from the local church or the association so much as from the able individuals who were moved to raise the level of Christian education in general and of ministerial education in particular through participation in the work of the special society. It should be emphasized, however, that the patrons of education in the societies strove constantly to maintain a close relationship between the general membership and the activities undertaken in the name of the denomination.[17]

The fourth type of organization developed by Baptists was *the convention.* It differed from the association mainly in that it drew more delegates from a larger territory. Cooperation on a national scale was first attempted in 1814, through the formation of the "General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions." Scheduled to

---

[16]Richard Furman stated that the Charleston (South Carolina) Association as early as 1790 maintained a theological library "for the education of pious young men now in divinity studies." — "Educational View of the Present State of the Baptist Churches in South Carolina," *Latter Day Luminary,* II (May, 1820), *222*; also, Philadelphia Baptist Association, *Minutes of the Association, 1707-1808* (Philadelphia, 1851), v.

[17]"Preamble to the Constitution of the Massachusetts Baptist Education Society," in "Minutes of the Massachusetts Baptist Association," MS. in the Library of the Andover Newton Theological Institution (1814), 13-6.

meet every three years, it was also known as the Triennial Convention. The plan of the Convention was influenced by efforts to satisfy two groups of possible supporters: those who wanted a large territorial organization, and those who adhered to a localized religious body as the basic element of Baptist organization. Because of the influence of the people from the South and the "West" in the first group, organizations and individuals were allowed to send messengers or representatives to the Convention upon the payment of a registration fee; and because of the influence of the people from the North and the East in the second group, no action of the Convention was considered arbitrarily binding upon any local church, association, or other society.[18]

In an effort to undergird the Triennial Convention, smaller conventions were organized in various states. The state conventions succeeded somewhat in developing a sense of unity and fellowship among the churches, and in promoting the establishment of academies, colleges, and universities. In spite of the state conventions, however, the Triennial Convention was ultimately dissolved, and independent boards and agencies were established to promote the denominational activities which the national body had undertaken.[19]

The formation of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1845, at least partially because of the controversial slavery issue; the launching of the Baptist World Alliance in 1905, the denomination's first effort to duplicate the convention on an international scale; and the organization of the Northern Baptist Convention in 1908 to assume the responsibilities and to perform the work of the independent boards and agencies in the North,[20] fall within the chronology of this study of speech education.

Early Educational Theory and Practice

Not all early Baptists were entirely friendly to education, nor were they totally desirous of an educated ministry. For their dis-

---

[18]"Constitution of the General Missionary Convention," *Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Magazine,* IV (September, 1814), 66-7; also, William W. Barnes, *The Southern Baptist Convention (Etc.)* (Seminary Hill, Texas, 1934), 1-80.

[19]A Committee of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions *(Etc.),* "The General Education Plan," *Latter Day Luminary,* II (May, 1820), 151; also, John T. Christian, *A History of the Baptists to 1845* (Nashville, 1926), 453.

[20]Baptist World Congress (Baptist World Alliance), "Correspondence," MSS., Letters, and Pamphlets, II vols. in the Library of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (July 11, 1905 ff.), n.p.

trust of learning they had specific reasons. In the first place, many early Baptists looked upon schools as human institutions that were unnecessary for the spread of Christianity according to New Testament patterns. In the next place, many members of the denomination did not believe that a man could be *made* into a preacher by education only. In fact, it seemed to them that some young preachers had become vain because of an education, and had thus become incapable of preaching to people of little learning; therefore, they contended that learning which had not Christianity as its basis undeniably ruined scholars for preaching. In the third place, the educated ministry of other religious groups — in many cases a state-supported ministry — had been associated with the persecution of people of the Baptist persuasion in Europe and in America.[21] John Bunyan in Bedford jail, Henry Dunster forced from the presidency of Harvard College,[22] and Baptist preachers defended by Patrick Henry in Virginia were vivid reminders of this persecution.[23] Finally, many Baptists believed that God, being all-powerful and able to make His Kingdom endure, did not need any class of men, learned ones included, to aid Him in His work.[24]

Nevertheless, there were educated Baptists sufficient in number to work for the establishment of theological schools. The first Baptist "school of the prophets" which educators succeeded in establishing in America was made possible by the vote of the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1756. At that time the Association agreed to sponsor an academy at Hopewell, New Jersey.[25] This academy was merged with the College of Rhode Island in 1764,[26] and the new school was named Brown University upon receipt of a large gift of money in 1808 for the establishment of a chair of sacred

[21]John Stanford, *A Discourse on the Utility of Learning to a Young Minister Considered (Etc.)* (New York, 1814), 15-23.

[22]J. Chapin, *Henry Dunster* (Boston, 1872), 175 ff.; also, Charles W. Gilkey, *The Distinctive Baptist Witness* (Chester, Pennsylvania, 1945), 2-3.

[23]James B. Taylor, *Virginia Baptist Ministers* (New York, 1860), II vols. *passim;* and, Lewis P. Little, *Imprisoned Preachers and Religious Liberty in Virginia* (Lynchburg, 1938), 1-538 *passim.*

[24]John Stanford, *op. cit.*

[25]Philadelphia Baptist Association, *op. cit.*, especially for the years 1800-7, p. varies; and, Seymour W. Adams, *Memoir of Rev. Nathaniel Kendrick, D.D.* (Philadelphia, 1860), 109-19.

[26]William Cathcart, *The Baptist Encyclopedia,* II vols. (Philadelphia, 1881), I:357-8.

rhetoric.[27] Brown University, though nominally Baptist, was limited by its charter to a course of secular arts and sciences. In spite of some agitation to do so, there were friends of the school who "did not think it expedient to attempt to connect with it, either directly or indirectly, a theological course."[28] This decision required that other schools be established for theological education, but it did not quell the objections to ministerial training.

Meeting the usual arguments against a learned ministry was a major objective of the members of education societies. A published "Address," sent out by the Baptist Education Society of the Middle States of America after its organization in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1812, contained some of the most widely accepted reasons for educating preachers. The author of the "Address" pointed out that the sacred Scriptures, written originally in languages different from English, had required the use of scholarship for translation; that the gift of tongues, spoken of in the Bible was no longer suddenly acquired by those who wished to preach; that the prophets of God in ancient times had schools of their own; that Baptists needed to appeal to people who could be "prevailed upon to attend only a ministry where evangelistic truth was united with classic learning"; and that since other denominations were busily engaged in acquiring an educated ministry, Baptists should not fall behind in the quality of their preachers.[29]

The same arguments used to establish the need for ministerial education were used by the Society of the Middle States for the initial promotion of a theological seminary on a wide scale. The Society was supported in its efforts by many Baptist leaders, and succeeded in establishing a "school in Philadelphia" in 1812.[30] Although it later gained the support of the Triennial Convention, the school in 1812 amounted only to an extension of the private tutoring which the Reverend Dr. William Staughton, a leading Baptist preacher and educator, had done for some time.[31]

---

[27]David Benedict, *A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America* (New York, 1848), 447-8.

[28]Irah Chase, "The Theological Institution at Philadelphia, 1818-1821," *Baptist Memorial and Monthly Intelligencer,* I (April, 1842), 101-6.

[29]"Address of the Baptist Education Society of the Middle States," *Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Magazine,* III (September, 1812), 211-5.

[30](Editorial), "Institution," *Latter Day Luminary,* I (August, 1818), 234.

[31]Northern Baptist Education Society, *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Directors (Etc.)* (Boston, 1831), 16-7.

In 1813 a group of Baptists in New York City, interested in assisting the "school at Philadelphia," organized themselves into A Board of Correspondence. After having directed finances and students to Philadelphia for a time, the Board, deciding to open its own Seminary, became the first group to use the phrase "Baptist Theological Seminary" officially in America. That term appeared in the minutes for the meeting held on November 21, 1816. The Seminary, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, was placed in the charge of Dr. John Stanford, the preacher-teacher who devised for use in a Baptist theological curriculum the earliest course of lectures on theology and on the composition and delivery of sermons that is now available.[32]

In spite of Dr. Stanford's efforts, the New York Baptist Theological Seminary was disbanded after six years of existence, and the Board thereafter directed students under its financial sponsorship to (Colgate in) Hamilton, New York.[33] But the "school at Philadelphia" fared little better than the one in New York City. Officially opened in 1817, the former was transferred to Washington, D. C., where it became a part of Congressionaly-chartered Columbian College. Caught in the crossfire of issues over finances and slavery, Columbian College lost the support of the denomination as a whole, and eventually became George Washington University.

So, as far as their educational theories and practices for ministerial education prior to 1819 were concerned, Baptists were individualistic to the point of a good deal of confusion and failure. There were members of the denomination who opposed any system of education, and there were those who believed so much in raising educational standards that they were willing to expend themselves and their resources in behalf of an educated ministry. It was a struggle before the adherents of both extremes joined forces to create a system of theological education, of which speech education was a part, that would produce the kind of preacher that all the leaders wanted in the denomination's pulpits.

---

[32]Board of Managers *(Etc.), op. cit.,* 1-36; and, John Stanford, *op. cit.,* 26-31.

[33]*Ibid.,* 85.

[34]Baptist General Convention, *Proceedings of the Sixth Triennial Meeting (Etc.)* (Philadelphia, 1829), 1-41; and, Northern Baptist Education Society, *Thirty-third and Thirty-fourth Report of the Directors (Etc.)* (Boston, 1848), 7.

THE CONTEMPORARY RHETORIC OF LAW

H. PHILIP CONSTANS*
and DALLAS C. DICKEY**

At the outset, we should determine what speaking is done by a lawyer in court. While the speaking is not the same in all cases or in all courts, the most that is done by lawyers takes place in the Circuit Court. Also, as far as speaking is concerned, a similar procedure applies in the Federal District Court as in the Circuit Court. Since, then, more legal speaking is done in Circuit Court, it is important to list the chief situations. They are the selection of the jury; opening address to the jury; examinations of witnesses and cross-examination of witnesses; objection to testimony and argument on the objections; and the closing argument or summation to the jury. Also, if the verdict is against the defendant, his lawyer may move and argue for a new trial or appeal.

Let us emphasize here, in passing, that a student of the rhetoric of law faces a great handicap in not knowing very much about how adequately or inadequately these speaking obligations are fulfilled. The simple truth is that speeches of lawyers as delivered are not available for analysis. Since court reporters generally record only the questions and answers on examination and cross-examination, our records of some of the most interesting and informative speaking in courts are meager and frequently inadequate and even inaccurate. Not infrequently the purported texts of the closing arguments are edited before they are published. As a result, we must rely very often on what observers have contributed as to what lawyers have said in given court situations. Also, we have but very little biographical or autobiographical information on a comparatively few lawyers which state what principles of composition or delivery the men have followed.

Despite our handicaps, however, from what has been recorded and what can be observed in watching lawyers at work, the astute

*Professor and Chairman, Department of Speech, University of Florida; Former President of the Speech Association of America and of the Southern Speech Association.

**Professor of Speech, University of Florida; Former President of the Southern Speech Association and Editor of *The Southern Speech Journal;* Editor of *The Speech Teacher*.

teacher of public speaking and argumentation can discern methods which he teaches even in his first courses. Some of these need to be mentioned to illustrate what we mean.

First, in observing a lawyer going through the process of selecting a jury in which his ultimate aim should be to secure persons who will give the case fair and impartial consideration, we may conclude that he is doing the job of individual audience analysis. Obviously, his questions seek to discover whether the prospective juror has hidden prejudices that will warp his judgment in the case. Certainly, too, the answers obtained by the lawyer reveal, in part at least, the level of intelligence, the occupation, the economic status, and possibly the emotional stability of the prospective juror. In most cases, lawyers seek to obtain jurors of character, courage, and a sense of responsibility equal to the obligations they will assume.

Second, the lawyer must inevitably do a great amount of informative or expository speaking. In his opening address to the jury he is supposed to give an impartial presentation of what he hopes to prove. The lawyer for the other side likewise presents the basis for the defense. Neither lawyer should argue, neither should distort, neither should try to introduce evidence nor resort to emotion. In short, what is done is comparable to the statement of the case by the affirmative and negative in a debate.

Third, a large amount of the speaking of lawyers is associated with the handling of witnesses and the process of cross-examination of witnesses. Undoubtedly the Oregon style of debate was the result of an awareness of the need to teach these principles and methodologies. Actually, the evidence used by lawyers is usually presented by witnesses who are subject to cross-examination. This is true notwithstanding the fact that a witness may be used simply to identify an object, such as the books of a company, a magazine or newspaper, article of clothing, revolver, or some other instrument. In these instances the identification is largely routine and does not call for expert knowledge.

Now the manner in which witnesses are handled by the lawyer who calls them is generally sympathetic, and he endeavors to assist in every way to give a straightforward account of what they know. This is by no means the case, however, when these same witnesses are cross-examined by the lawyer on the other side. Very often he endeavors to confuse, browbeat, cajole, irritate, annoy, anger, ridi-

cule, mislead, or trap the witness. Moreover, he seeks to bring out flaws, inconsistencies, or implausibilities. Sometimes his questions are aimed at impeaching the witness rather than attacking a particular piece of testimony. The training we give our students in public speaking classes is seemingly remote from this kind of speaking our prospective lawyers will be doing. Is it something we should provide for in our classes? Should we encourage more cross-examination techniques in our argumentation classes? Whether or not we like the ethics of the cross-examination situation, lawyers are compelled to do it inevitably.

A very interesting amount of speaking done by lawyers, and which is really part and parcel the result of examining and cross-examining witnesses, is that which occurs when lawyers take an accepted fact but give it interpretations that are diametrically opposed. For instance, it comes out as a fact that a man habitually carries a gun on his person. One lawyer may interpret this as showing he is a "gun toter" who is spoiling for a fight; the opposing counsel may interpret this as showing the man is timid, afraid he will be unable to defend himself unless so armed. Again, a witness tells his story in a fluent manner. His counsel says that the man obviously has nothing to conceal, and that he is giving a straight-forward account; the opposing counsel says the man's fluency shows that the story has been rehearsed, and that its very smoothness casts a doubt on its genuineness. Another witness pauses and thinks before answering and may ask to have a question repeated. His counsel says this shows the witness is cautious and desires to weigh his answers — the mark of a good witness; the opposing counsel says that the hesitancy of the witness in answering shows that he is holding something back and is trying to stall for time — the mark of a poor witness. Is not this total situation one which indicates that in our teaching we should endeavor to have students proceed with great care when they come to interpreting facts? We may say "facts are facts" — true, but what these facts mean is where the differences frequently arise.

Another interesting part of any trial takes place when a lawyer seeks to qualify a witness as an expert, such as may be the case with a doctor, psychiatrist, handwriting expert, toxicologist, ballistics expert, and the like. Consequently, questions put to such persons reveal the witness' depth and breadth of training, length and type of

experience, opportunity for observation and the forming of an opinion, and his standing in the profession. All the above fits in neatly with what teachers of public speaking call the tests for use of authority. An awareness of how much use the future lawyer will make of them may lead us to be more diligent in teaching the important guides for establishing who an expert is, i.e., 1. Is he qualified? 2. Had he opportunity for fair observation? 3. Is he likely to be accepted? 4. Is he impartial? An examination of the summation speeches of Mr. Darrow and Mr. Crowe in the famous Leopold-Loeb Case will reveal how each on examination and cross-examination sought to establish his experts and tear down those of his opponent.

The testimony presented by witnesses under examination and cross-examination frequently produces conflict. Sometimes a lawyer will merely point out the disagreement and leave it to the jury as to which witness is to be believed. Generally, however, he goes beyond this and introduces circumstances that would be likely to influence a witness, such as those of family relationship, interest in the case, publicity or notoriety-seeking tendencies, age or vagueness of memory. Read the speech of Daniel Webster in the White-Knapp murder case for choice examples of these devices.

Fourth, in connection with the testimony of witnesses there often occurs one of the most dramatic and exciting moments in a trial when one of the lawyers jumps to his feet and calls out "I object." When he states the ground for his objection, we frequently hear the words "incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial," followed by the phrase "not binding on this defendant," or "no proper foundation laid." Unless the judge rules immediately, there may follow an argument directed to him by the attorneys on both sides of the case. The arguments then presented have a legal basis and may not be of interest to the spectator or even the public speaking teacher. Nevertheless, this is a part of the speaking of a lawyer, and students we now have in classes need to be taught to trace and develop close lines of demarcation in thought and to understand the principles underlying all argumentative discourse.

When all the evidence is in, we hear the words "the defense rests." At this point, looking back on the trial, we can generally find a pattern or plan — an outline if you will — that has been followed. In a capital case we invariably find the prosecution seeking to establish a motive for the act and the defense denying or belittling

the motive that has been advanced. We may ask the reason for this very apparent attempt to show a motive, be it revenge, hatred, rage, money, valuables or what not. The reasoning goes somewhat as follows: nothing happens by mere chance or coincidence; there is a reason for everything; every result has a cause. The result is obvious; a man has been attacked, robbed, or killed. Because all life seems to show causal relation, the lawyer believes the same principle applies to human action. Everything has an explanation, and in that explanation he hopes to find the key to the problem. The principle of causal relation, so well known to teachers of public speaking, may well be taught with far more discernment for what lawyers, as well as preachers and all other speakers, must inevitably employ.

Fifth, the closing argument or summation to the jury is the high point of the trial insofar as speaking is concerned. Unfortunately, such speeches, so vitally essential to the study of the rhetoric of law, are rarely recorded so that they can be examined by the student of legal speaking. However, upon reading those that have been preserved and in taking advantage of the opportunities to hear good lawyers before juries, we can note certain rhetorical devices being used. Nearly always we observe the attempt of the lawyer to secure a fair hearing, to remove prejudices against the defendant or the lawyer if he comes from a section of the state or nation other than that where the trial is held. Likewise, the jury can be complimented for their sense of fair play, duty, loyalty to their oath, or they may be urged to uphold law and order, decency, and the preservation of society or the state. In short, lawyers run the gamut in making persuasive or emotional appeals relying upon fear, religious and racial prejudices and tolerance, the sanctity of home, mercy, and justice. We find, too, that lawyers employ with great design what may be called "emphasis climax." As a point of criticism, however, we all too frequently fail to observe the principle of unity employed as a guiding principle. Also, somewhere in the closing arguments, usually near the beginning or at the end, we hear the lawyer telling the jury of the importance of the case. Now, as a matter of fact, every case *is* important — to the litigants, if nobody else. However, there is a deeper, more important consideration: namely, that the jurors may take their obligation to bring in a verdict with the se-

riousness that is essential if the jury system is to continue to receive respect and confidence.

To the courtroom spectator the trial may seem at times to take on the aspect of a game or even a spectacle; but, taken by and large, the speaking is about on the level of the man doing it. He uses rhetorical principles we know to be apparent as teachers of public speaking, and the aspects of his delivery we recognize as no departures from what we find prescribed in our best textbooks. Again, it is essentially the responsibility of the teacher of public speaking to be aware of the kind of pleading a lawyer will do as he assumes to appeal in the final minutes of a trial and as he endeavors to obtain the jury decision that will follow his speaking. The court system with its procedures is with us. Brilliant students in our public speaking and argumentation courses will enter our colleges of law and will be engaged in legal cases before judges and juries. The amount and kind of training we give them will be reflected in the speaking they do in the court situations in which they find themselves.

A CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS*

J. JEFFERY AUER** and HENRY LEE EWBANK***

One of the most persistent problems in discussion courses is that of developing an adequate concept of discussion and hence of discussion leadership. It is clear, we think, that we should be training students to take their places as citizens of a democracy. It is equally clear that tendencies toward *laissez-faire* on the one hand and dictatorship on the other can be found in our society. This is understandable. There are crises when someone must act immediately without discussion, and situations when the group wants to keep on discussing after the time has come for decision. There are leaders who like to sit back and let the discussion wander where it will, and others who want to dominate the meeting and make the decisions.

The teacher of discussion needs to be a sort of "general specialist," drawing information from various fields of knowledge. He should know how discussion works, or can be made to work, in our courts, our classrooms, our churches, and our legislative assemblies. He should also observe the behavior of individuals in different groups. He should be familiar with current research in such fields as speech, education, and social psychology, on the psychology of groups, group leadership, and the process by which groups attempt to achieve their goals.

Another persistent question concerns the organization of discussion courses. One teacher presents, at considerable length, the history of discussion, and the theories on which it is based, before students have the opportunity to discuss questions in which they are interested. Another teacher begins class discussions almost immediately, supplying the historical and psychological information as it is needed. One begins with the *why* of discussion; the other with the *how*. One approach may be *logical*, the other *psychological*, and somewhere the twain may meet.

While we have our opinion on these two procedures, it is not

---

*This article is adapted from the authors' forthcoming revised edition of their *Handbook for Discussion Leaders*.

**Professor and Chairman of the Department of Speech and Drama, University of Virginia; Editor of *Speech Monographs*.

***Professor of Speech, The University of Wisconsin; Former President and Executive Secretary of the Speech Association of America.

pertinent here. What is important is that students learn both the *why* and the *how* of discussion. To that end we have gathered and summarized concepts of group behavior and group leadership that we find helpful in training leaders and members of discussion groups.

I. An Analysis of Group Behavior

Every speaker knows that his effectiveness depends on establishing lines of communication with his listeners. This means gathering advance information on the age, sex, occupation, education, economic status, church membership, cultural activities, and political affiliations, of the expected audience. In addition, the leader needs to know how members of his group react to each other. The following seven characteristics of group behavior — or aspects of a group's "personality" — should aid the leader in making his analysis. These tendencies to act vary in strength in different groups and in the same group in discussing different topics.

1. *Group conformity.* Most of us tend to behave in ways that will gain recognition, admiration, respect, or approval from the groups to which we belong. Through trial and error we have learned that if we conform to accepted standards our group relationships are happier. Thus our beliefs and actions are often influenced more by group opinion than by expert opinion. This is not a rule without its exceptions, but it is common enough to be a significant characteristic of group personality. The degree of conformity determines how free members feel to express their own ideas, and how much these ideas are appreciated by others. Some writers call the group atmosphere "permissive" when little conformity is demanded, "autocratic" when initiative is discouraged.

2. *Group prejudices.* Few of us willingly admit holding prejudices which make us intolerant of other people's race, religion, nationality, or social status. But we do know that other people are often prejudiced! In groups of likeminded people prejudice is often clearly evident. In fact the prejudice of an individual may be intensified when he is within his group, and apparent even when he is apart from his fellows.

3. *Group resistance to change.* Social changes within or among groups seldom win complete and immediate acceptance. Thus the degree to which a group resists change, either within the group or

in its relations with others, is an important index of the group personality. Equally characteristic may be the group's standard methods for effecting change, whether by dictation of the leader, group consensus, or some "middle way."

4. *Group structure.* Research workers are studying the status of individuals and their relations to each other, both in the parent organization and through sub-groups. These sub-groups develop because members have different interests, or because it is more efficient to have various committees working on different association projects, or because it is more convenient to have a number of smaller meetings than one large one. The activities of these sub-groups and their relationship to the parent organization, may profoundly effect (a) the ways in which members communicate with each other, (b) the ways they feel about each other, or (c) the ways in which members control each other. In organizations where group procedures have broken down, an analysis of the group structure may be the first step in restoring its usefulness.

5. *Group values.* Any group is likely to endorse and maintain values, or ideals, which differentiate it from others. An analysis of these values will aid in understanding a group's personality. It may also explain the aggressiveness one group displays toward others. And such an analysis of group values will provide a basis for predicting the programs, activities, and actions a group is likely to support.

6. *Group patterns of discussion.* All the characteristics listed above will influence the method and effectiveness of group discussion. Suppose, for example, that a group has a high regard for majority rule, is accustomed to formal meetings and enforces strict parliamentary rules, makes little resistance to change, encourages members with differing opinions to speak freely, and has few strong prejudices. For such a group, one might be able to predict with considerable accuracy the patterns of discussion most likely to be followed, and to estimate their probable effectiveness.

7. *Group patterns of decision.* In some groups discussions are made by *authority,* the rule of one individual. In more democratic groups decisions are made by *enumeration,* counting votes after adequate discussion. In others, decisions represent a *compromise* between proponents and opponents of a course of action in which both sides yield part of their views to reach a decision. In a very real

sense, a democracy is government by compromise. Under the most favorable conditions, groups may reach decisions by *consensus,* a synthesis of the views of all members. These favorable conditions seldom exist if a group feels outside pressure, works under a state of tension, or to meet a deadline.

We should emphasize the fact that the analysis of any group is not a simple matter. Groups are complex in makeup and intricate in procedures. But if discussion leaders are to function effectively, they must analyze and identify the personality characteristics of their groups.

II. The Nature of Group Leadership

The glib assertion that "leaders are born not made," is at best only partly true. We know of people who become leaders after initial failures and repeated attempts. Moreover, there are degrees of leadership. Some can lead a platoon, others a regiment, while a few can lead an army.

Various researchers have tried to discover whether there are qualities common to all leaders, but the facts are still elusive. The precise nature of leadership is yet to be defined, though certain generalizations may be made. We do know that those regarded as leaders are likely either to be very skilled in human relations, or adept at manipulating and controlling the actions of others. We also know that many acknowledged leaders obtain their status through personal prestige, while others obtain it because they are feared. And we know that some have leadership status because of the positions they hold, others are leaders without official sanction. But we seldom find anything that can be called a common "leadership personality." Rather we find that quite different sets of skills and techniques, exercised by different people, bring similar results. And we often discover that a leader who is effective in one situation fails in another.

We conclude, therefore, (a) that leadership is not a stable quality, identifiable in all leaders or in all situations, (b) we need to study leaders in various situations to learn what they do and what the groups expects of them. Recent investigations indicate that the following are significant considerations:

1. *The group personality determines its concept of leadership.*

As we have indicated, one can estimate the personality of any group in terms of seven basic characteristics. The combination of these characteristics determines whether a group conceives of its leaders as benevolent despots who initiate all action and make all decisions, as mere presiding officers for discussions in which group members decide for themselves, or as something in between.

2. *The group concept of leadership influences the techniques of its leaders.* If members behave as though they want someone to tell them what to do someone is likely to do just that. Even a leader who wants to encourage members to participate in discussion and make their own decisions may, if they fail to respond promptly, succumb to the temptation to tell them what to do.

3. *The leader's personality and emotional needs determine his concept of leadership.* The personality of a leader may be just as influential in determining the quality of leadership as the personality characteristics of the group. If he likes being a "boss," and the emotional satisfaction that autocratic behavior sometimes brings, it will be easy for him to mistrust the intelligence of the group and conclude that he must dominate it. Conversely, if he finds emotional security in "team play," he will guide and encourage his group to rely upon its own judgment.

4. *The leader's concept of leadership influences his techniques.* The leader who conceives of "boss rule" — benevolent, he is sure — as his proper function, develops appropriate techniques. He sees that a rigid agenda is drawn up for every meeting, leaving nothing to chance; he interposes his own views into the discusson frequently, and uses positive suggestion to see that they are respected. The democratic leader develops other techniques in accord with his philosophy. He encourages the group to develop its own plans, not blocking even spontaneous changes; he keeps his own views in the background, encourages members to participate freely, and helps them to synthesize their views.

We are concerned, in deriving these concepts, with the development of democratic leaders, not autocratic ones. This statement poses many persistent problems concerning group leadership and discussion techniques, for which the course in discussion should provide at least tentative answers. Among the questions that frequently plague the democratic discussion leader are these:

a. How much previous planning and forecasting of the group process is consistent with democratic leadership?
b. How far can the leader let his group "go it alone" without actually frustrating its members?
c. How much should the desire for efficiency in accomplishing group goals influence the leader?
d. How much attention should the leader call to the problem-solving process, when to do so may reduce attention to the problem at hand?
e. How can the leader develop techniques that will utilize his knowledge and ability, yet keep the mood of free group participation?

III. The Nature of Group Membership

A college admissions director once greeted a particular set of recommendations with such joy that his staff came running. "Look," he exclaimed, "here is a boy who is commended by his high school principal as 'a good follower.' That's all we need to know to admit him. After all, we've already let in four hundred people who've been labelled 'leaders,' and God knows they'll need at least one follower!" This is more than a true and perhaps amusing story. It implies that everyone can be classified as "leader" or "follower," that "once a follower, always a follower," and that followers are second class citizens. The evidence at hand convinces us that these assumptions are false, that with proper training most of our students can become effective leaders, at least of small and local groups.

Much confusion stems from the tendency to think of "membership" as "followership." One dictionary defines membership as being "an integral part of the whole." Applied to discussion, this means that members should be vitally concerned with the meeting's success and should demonstrate their concern by taking an active part in the group project. This is an ideal rather than the usual situation. We all know individuals who just "come along for the ride." Some may never take an active part in discussion. They may be timid or just not interested. But more are non-participants because they do not know what to do. They may have belonged to groups where the leader did not encourage the expression of oppos-

ing views. Their training may have been passive acceptance of real or asserted authority.

Training members for active participation is a function of group leadership; the nominal leader should regard such training as one of his primary obligations, and the course in discussion should provide suggestions for achieving it. What are the responsibilities of group membership? Here is a list which includes some designed to give members something important to do.

a. Sharing in the development and maintenance of group values and morale.
b. Participating in planning general and specific group goals.
c. Contributing to the group enterprise with assurance that these contributions are desired and will be carefully considered.
d. Undertaking responsibility for a share of the group leadership.
e. Employing appropriate skills and techniques for effective communiaction within the group.
f. Understanding and adjusting to the emotional needs and tensions of other members.
g. Participating in the evaluation of the group's progress towards its goals and of the techniques it employs.

The alert student may note that this list is similar to outlines of the leader's responsibilities. He should be told that the similarity is intentional. We believe that members of discussion groups should understand and be prepared to share the leadership function. Of course, all members will not be expected to do all of these things. Nor is it necessary. We believe, however, that the leader should encourage members to develop leadership skills so they may form and lead other groups. We would not agree with those who advocate "leaderless" discussions, but we do think it appropriate to speak of "shared leadership," especially in small groups.

IV. The Leadership Function

We use the term "leadership function," rather than "functions of *the* leader," to emphasize our belief that it is more important that the tasks of leadership be performed than to designate who should do them. The leader, chairman, or moderator, is usually assumed to be responsible for these necessary leadership tasks. But he may

share some of these duties with qualified members, and such members may on their own initiative assist in keeping the discussion on the track and running smoothly. Indeed, as we have already suggested, one of the obligations of leadership, in the best sense, is to train and encourage members to assume as many of the leadership functions as they can.

Students of discussion sometimes classify members according to their typical participations in meetings. These classifications, sometimes referred to as "member roles," are of two sorts: (a) those pertaining to *group functioning,* i. e., building, improving and maintaining the group process; (b) those pertaining to *problem-solving,* i.e., locating, defining, analyzing and solving the problem confronting the group. While we may think of them as patterns of membership, we also consider them as elements of the leadership function. There is no magic in the labels used in the following classifications. They are helpful in identifying and analyzing types of participation. They may also help members evaluate their own contributions, and those of other members, to the success or failure of the meeting.

These are common types of member roles, considered in their relation to *group functioning:*

1. *The morale builder* encourages individual contributors, creates a receptive atmosphere for new points of view, and commends those who deserve it. "That's an important fact to consider, Mary. . ."

2. *The conciliator* recognizes differences of opinion, tries to anticipate conflicts and relieve tensions by stressing common goals and emphasizing cohesiveness. "Are we really as far apart as you seem to think, Jones? After all, we do agree that. . ."

3. *The compromiser* aims at reconciling conflicting views, even if it means modifying his own opinions, and seeks for middle ground in the interests of group harmony. "I'll go halfway with you, Tom, and agree that we. . ."

4. *The expediter* helps the communication process by facilitating the contributions of others, especially when some members may be slowing up that process. "Look, why don't we agree that each person can make a two-minute statement of his views on this point?"

5. *The standard-setter* helps maintain a high level of group achievement in the quality of thinking and in solving the problem

at hand. "Can we really be satisfied with this analysis? I'm inclined to think we've been pretty hasty. . ."

6. *The process observer,* as the term suggests, does not usually take part in the discussion. He sits on the sidelines and takes notes on the procedure. He may offer suggestions to the leader during the meeting. In the evaluation session afterwards he helps members evaluate their own contributions. In this sense his duties resemble those of the critic judge of a debate. In another sense, however, every member of the group may be a process observer.

Members may also be classified according to the relation of their contribution to *problem-solving:*

1. *The inquirer* is concerned with the raw materials of reasoning; these may be facts or ways of interpreting facts. "Let's get down to cases. Just how many times. . .?"
2. *The contributor* tries to provide the bases for sound discussion by submitting factual information or considered opinions about facts. "I think that the last census actually shows that. . ."
3. *The elaborator* often performs an essential function by translating generalizations into concrete examples, or by projecting the effects of a proposed course of action. "Let's see what would happen if we tried to apply that suggestion to our local situation. . ."
4. *The reviewer* tries to clarify relations among various ideas presented, or attempts to redefine the group position in terms of agreed objectives. "When we began this discussion we thought . . . but now it appears that. . ."
5. *The evaluator* looks at the group's thinking in terms of its own standards. He may raise questions about the evidence and argument, or the practical application of a proposed solution. "It just occurs to me to wonder whether we're going to be satisfied if we decide that. . ."
6. *The energizer* wants to keep the discussion moving, on the beam, and does it by prodding the members, encouraging or arousing them to settle on a course of action. "This discussion is very interesting, but is it really helping to solve our problem?"
7. *The group recorder,* or secretary, summarizes the discussion, noting the most important points and any decisions that may be reached. He may or may not be an actively participating group member, and sometimes in small groups it may be practical to have

the nominal leader perform this function. It is, in any case, one of the essential leadership functions.

While we are considering individual contributions to effective group functioning and problem-solving, we should recognize that in many groups there are members who make only negative contributions to the meeting. In effect their contributions test the skill of the leader.

Here are a few types:

1. *The dominator* tries to run the show, asserting real or alleged authority, demanding attention, interrupting others, making arbitrary decisions, and insisting upon having the last word. "Now I've had some experience at this sort of thing, and let me tell you what to do. . ."

2. *The blocker* is often a frustrated dominator. When he finds his authority is not conceded, or when the majority is moving in another direction, he becomes stubborn and resists the group on every count. "That idea will never work; you might just as well throw it out. ."

3. *The cynic* sometimes succeeds the blocker. Thwarted in his isolated position he scoffs at the group process, deliberately provokes conflict, or becomes painfully nonchalant. "It's obvious that you people will never agree; let's call it quits."

4. *The security-seeker* may want sympathy, or just personal recognition. In one case he becomes self-deprecatory about his own plight, in the other he continually calls attention to his own apparently unique experiences and accomplishments. "I had worse than that happen to me once . . . and I wish you'd tell me what I should have done."

5. *The lobbyist* is continually plugging his own pet theories, or pleading the special interests of other groups to which he may belong, although he is seldom willing to register as a lobbyist. "Now you understand this makes no difference to me, but don't you think we're being unfair to. . .?"

These labels are simply a convenient way of discussing some specific aspects of group behavior. How to encourage the valuable contributions to the leadership function, and how to decrease the number of negative ones, is the real problem of the course in discussion methods.

This general point of view, introduced early in the discussion

course, we have found useful in giving to students a working concept of group leadership. For those who wish to investigate this concept further we append a selected list of references.

Adult Leadership, a monthly publication of the Adult Education Association, May, 1952, to date.

Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin, eds., *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory* (Evanston, Ill., 1953).

Chase, Stuart, *Power of Words* (New York, 1954).

Doob, Leonard W., *Social Psychology: An Analysis of Human Behavior* (New York, 1952).

Sherif, Muzafer, and Wilson, M. O., eds., *Group Relations at the Crossroads* (New York, 1953).

Whyte, William F., "Leadership and Group Participation," *Bulletin,* New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University (Ithaca, New York, May, 1953).

GENERAL SEMANTICS FOR THE DEBATER

GLENN R. CAPP*

INTRODUCTION

Alfred Korzybski's book SCIENCE AND SANITY carries the byline, *an Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics,* and he elaborates on this concept in the introduction. Since the traditional methods of the debater are based on the Aristotelian concept of logic, should we conclude that the methods used by the debater are antithetical to the teachings of general semantics? If such be true, the debater need not bother himself with a study of general semantics. If, however, we find that general semantics offers an additional method to those traditionally used by the debater, then he may utilize semantic principles to make his advocacy more adequate.

The term *general semantics* as used here does not lend itself to a "one and only" definition; rather it must be explained in terms of what it purports to do. Korzybski makes the following explanation:

> General semantics is not any 'philosophy,' or 'psychology,' or 'logic,' in the ordinary sense. It is a new extensional discipline which explains and trains us how to use our nervous systems most efficiently. It is not a medical science, but like bacteriology, it is indispensable for medicine in general, and for psychiatry, mental hygiene, and education in particular. In brief, it is the formulation of a new non-aristotelian system of orientation which affects every branch of science and life.[1]

Lee gives the following explanation of the term:

> It [general semantics] has to do with whether or not what a speaker says properly evaluates the situation to which he refers; whether or not what he says is an adequate representation of the actual facts or happenings of which he speaks. . . .
>
> General semantics must not be thought of as a branch of philology or as an instrument for popular debunking, but as a natural science concerned with the problem of values and so of interpretation, i. e., with the whole process whereby men in speaking evaluate properly the happenings, objects, feelings, labels, descriptions, and inferences with which they are dealing.[2]

---

*Professor and Chairman, Department of Speech and Radio, Baylor University; Former President of The Southern Speech Association.

[1]Alfred Korzybski, *Science and Sanity* (Lancaster, 1941), VI.

[2]Irving J. Lee, "General Semantics and Public Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* XXVI (December, 1940), 597.

In brief, general semantics may be characterized as a study in how to talk accurately, how to fit words to actual things, how to eliminate language habits which lead to confusion and misunderstanding, or how to talk sense.

Controversy Between Rhetoric and General Semantics

A review of articles in various speech periodicals reveals an interesting controversy on whether general semantics has anything to offer in the traditional courses in rhetoric, public speaking, and debate.

In the December, 1940, Quarterly Journal of Speech, Lee outlines the tenents of traditional rhetoric and compares the objectives of the rhetorician with what the general semanticists attempts to accomplish. He reviews the propaganda techniques of Hitler and draws a parallel between his methods and those of the ancient rhetoricians, especially the Sophists and Aristotle. He makes the distinction, however, between the "end" purpose of Hitler and Aristotle, pointing out that Aristotle emphasizes the ethical qualities of speaking for worthy causes while Hitler was concerned simply with effectiveness. Lee states:

> Hitler and Aristotle start with this question: How can we persuade others to think as we do and to act as we would have them to act? Korzybski starts with this question: How can I talk about events of this world so that my talk evaluates them properly?[3]

In the same issue of the Quarterly Journal of Speech, Barnard outlines some of the objectives of general semantics and stresses the importance of teaching the subject in such courses as public speaking and debate. He states:

> It is in the field of original speech that Semantics has its greatest bearing: public speaking, debate, discussion, oratory, extemporaneous speaking, etc. This is the field of controversy because words are used concerning probabilities, not demonstrable processes. Korzybski cautions us to proceed carefully so that members of an audience will receive relatively the same meaning from the speaker, who must be particularly careful in his use of abstractions. . . . We cannot get away from propaganda; it is all about us, from harmless advertising to causes and crusades. The issue becomes: How best to learn to evaluate

[3] *Ibid.*, 601.

what we hear and read. . . . The applications of semantics to speech situations are endless. . . . We as speech teachers need to make a few applications, also.[4]

In the April, 1942, QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, Lee advances the idea that general semantics is just another way of looking at a speech; that its purposes are not antagonistic to those of traditional rhetoric. He discusses the dominant concern of the rhetorician, the student of meaning or semanticist, the logician, and the general semanticist. After looking at the approaches of the first three, he explains that the general semanticist picks up where the others leave off. The general semanticist elaborates his findings by a methodology which reveals the unnoticed nuances and subleties of inaccuracy and improper evaluation. Lee states:

Both the student of meanings and the logician focus on verbal matters so thoroughly that both they and we may tend to forget that there is also a nonverbal world to be accounted for. . . . He seeks to check the language at every point for the relationships it has to the discoverable facts of life. He would stress what most students seem not to have realized: that language has no further function than to serve as a form of representation of something else.[5]

In contending that rhetoric and general semantics may not be antagonistic, Lee further states:

The unfamiliar procedures are looked upon as something antithetical, antagonistic, ready to replace the old and the presumed worn out. But new methodologies may well not be antithetical but complementary, not antagonistic. but additive.[6]

The February, 1944, QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, carries two articles of interest on the subject which introduced a new phase into the discussion. Aly[7] develops the thesis that semanticists use rhetorical methods to advance their own cause. While he does not condemn a study of general semantics, he contends that semantics does not supplant rhetoric.

Murray,[8] in dialogue form, shows how general semantics is used in each step in public speaking. His contentions may be summar-

---

[4]Raymond B. Barnard, "General Semantics and the Controversial Phases of Speech," *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* XXVI (December, 1940), 603-606.

[5]Irving J. Lee, "Four Ways of Looking at a Speech," *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* XXVIII (April, 1942), 154.

[6]*Ibid.,* 149.

[7]Bower Aly, "The Rhetoric of Semantics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* XXX (February, 1944), 23.

[8]Elwood Murray, "The Semantics of Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* XXX (February, 1944), 38.

ized in the following eight points: (1) The general semanticist realizes that the situation he evaluates is in constant change, that his facts are-in-process, that he can only become acquainted partially with these facts. (2) The semanticist weighs his evidence with greater discrimination. He gives first attention and weight to detailed first order descriptions and reports which refer to specific dates and circumstances. (3) In not confusing the different levels of abstracting the speaker becomes increasingly careful in observing his facts. Although he sees similarities he also sees the differences within the similarities. (4) His research and his reflection upon his materials become incomparably more thorough and more deliberative. (5) He is aware that statements about facts never represent all the facts. (6) He sees the "black" in the "white," the "true" in the "false," the "false" in the "true," and is aware that no statement can correspond exactly and completely to its "fact territory." (7) In habitual ordering his reactions with much greater emphasis upon materials at the bottom of the abstracting ladder the speaking tends to be more concrete, specific, and less general. (8) It makes the speaker recognize the audience more; he becomes more objective.

Callaghan raises the question: Does general semantics have anything to contribute to a course in speech? He states:

> Semantics tends to enhance skill in the employment of symbols to effect desired responses. Such skill is the essence of speech. Semantics, then, is ancillary, if not prerequisite, to speech; it is so fundamental that every day in our classes we are teaching it, even though we know not what we do or in whose name.[9]

These writers indicate that there need be nothing fundamentally antithetical between the purposes of the general semanticist and the traditional rhetorician. Rather than considering the methods used as antagonistic, the debater may use semantic principles to improve his methods. The question arises: How can this be done?

General Semantics Contribution to Debate

Edward S. Robinson, in his book Law and the Lawyers, says: "The world is not divided into scientific people and unscientific

[9] J. Calvin Callaghan, "Semantics — Pedantic Antics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXXI (February, 1945), 77.

people, but rather into groups of problems for which our general culture provides us with a scientific approach."[10] The "scientific approach" includes a "methodology." The methods employed by the debater in gaining acceptance to his proposals grow out of writings and practices starting with the ancient Greeks. Some have questioned whether his methods present a scientific approach. The following statement by Harrison S. Elliott illustrates:

> The ordinary methods of argument and debate, carried on in deliberative groups, are really a denial of a true democratic process. Usually, such deliberations represent a contest in which one side is trying to defeat the other, or the pleading of a case, in which the person or the committee making the presentation is seeking to win the group. Indeed, the whole procedure is one of contest. Care is taken to present only the facts which support one's position, and to ignore or minimize the weight of the considerations in opposition. Anything which withholds important information or tends to put a peculiar construction on facts defeats the democratic process at the start.[11]

The idea that the debater sometimes conceals facts and thus gives an inadequate and incomplete statement of his case constitutes the source for the main criticism.

Although some methods used by the advocate may seem questionable, this does not invalidate his essential part in the democratic process. For example, in law the accused has the right to have his case presented in its most favorable light. His lawyer is obligated to build the strongest case possible for him consistent with the prevailing facts. That some advocates distort the facts and go beyond them, thus presenting a case false-to-fact, does not alter the principle that every man is entitled to "his day" in court.

In deliberative assemblies, when measures for social legislation have been narrowed to a specific proposal, the consideration of the adoption of that proposal arises. The advocate should present the strongest case possible for or against the proposal in keeping with his convictions. He has the responsibility, however, for proper evaluation and for presenting information true-to-fact. In human relations any cause must have its ideals promulgated or progress becomes impossible. The principle involved cannot be doubted; but methods used by the advocate in carrying out the principles may well be questioned. May his techniques and methods be improved?

---

[10]Edward S. Robinson, *Law and the Lawyers* (New York, 1935), 8.

[11]Harrison S. Elliott, *The Process of Group Thinking* (New York, 1932), 18-19.

Will a knowledge of general semantics improve the methods of the debater so that his evaluations will be more adequate? Specific areas of conflict and agreement must first be considered.

First, the student of debate is trained to stress those factors favorable to his own cause; not by presenting false evidence but by stressing only that favorable. The following statement from Cicero's DE ORATORE illustrates:

In pleading, my usual method is to fix on whatever strong points the cause has, and to illustrate and make the most of them, dwelling on them, insisting on them, clinging to them; but to hold back from the weak or defective points in such a way that I may not appear to shun them, but that their whole force may be dissembled and overwhelmed by the ornament and amplification of the strong points.[12]

The advocate usually talks as if the details he abstracts constitute *all* the facts. He selects only those facts which suit his purpose. The general semanticist stresses a more complete or proper analysis. He does not necessarily observe all the facts but he realizes that his abstractions do not make up all the facts and does not talk as though they do. He recognizes the impossibility of saying *all* about anything for some features must always be omitted. Lee recognizes this principle:

. . . it should be clear that in speaking and acting one can only abstract some of the details while omitting others. Consciousness of abstracting as a habitual reaction will lead directly to attitudes of non-allness. This consciousness is the coveted first step in proper evaluation, for when men act as if what they say says "all," delusions and improper evaluation are inevitable.[13]

Another principle of general semantics of value to the debater consists of the realization that his talk is often "abstraction of highest order." He does not always talk about the object itself but often makes statements about statements. The semanticist distinguishes between the verbal and non-verbal levels. This may be better described as the feeling "inside-the-skin" — feelings, reactions, and evaluations experienced as a result of the object talked about. Then we may make descriptive statements about the object. These statements, on the verbal level, are second order abstractions. Statements may then be made about the descriptions which constitute abstractions of highest order, and are inferential in character. The debater often deals with inferential statements from other inferential state-

[12]Cicero, *De Oratore,* II, LXXII.

[13]Irving J. Lee, *Language Habits in Human Affairs* (New York, 1941), 63.

ments. While inferential statements are necessary in life situations they inject modifications of the facts and should be distinguished from descriptions. Many debaters are inadequately trained to recognize or employ these differences.

The general semanticist uses the devices of dating his statements, indexing, use of ETC, quotation marks, and hyphens, for the purpose of making proper evaluations. The student of debate fails to use such devices out of deference to building a stronger case. The rhetorician sometimes talks in terms of similarities while the semanticists recognizes differences. In brief, the advocate tries to induce others to believe and act as he would have them believe and act, while the semanticist purports to talk about existing facts so that his declarations give proper evaluation. A debater can be trained to evaluate properly without decreasing his effectiveness. So trained, he should become a more effective advocate.

Three tools used by the debater, wherein a knowledge of general semantics might be applied in making his evaluations more exact, will be discussed. These tools are definitions, evidence, and reasoning.

In debate the definition of terms, as a part of analysis, becomes an important function. Alan Nichols says:

> . . . in order to have a fruitful debate, it is necessary . . . that the debater possess a common, exact understanding of the proposition and its terms. If one side, either through malice or mistake, asserts the proposition to mean one thing, while the other side believes it to mean something else, then the debate is converted into a quibble over definitions and terms. The effect may, indeed, be such that the substantial merits and demerits of your proposed specific solution to the problem are entirely ignored.[14]

In a debate between Clarence Darrow and Will Durant on the subject "Is Man a Machine?" the discussion resolved to a great extent around the meaning of the word *machine*. The speakers were, for the most part, not arguing the same question. The role of definition may go deeper than the misunderstandings occasioned by the failure to agree upon terms in a proposition. Terms used in the pleadings of the advocate, for example, may have a different meaning to the juror, the legislator, the opponent or the member of an audience.

The semanticist recognizes that any word may be used in many

---

[14]Alan Nichols, *Discussion and Debate* (New York, 1941), 114.

ways and that a single thing may be said in several ways. He stresses the futility of general definitions because he recognizes that words have a history and change their uses. Definitions by means of a dictionary is a collective process while defining for the purposes of debate is selective. Ofter terms used by the debater take on new meaning in the light of changing conditions, hence the definitions found in a dictionary would lead to misunderstanding. More specifically, the semanticist recognizes that no word or term may have an exact meaning outside of its context. When considered outside of its context we tend to assume exactness and forget that a single word may have many uses. This causes us to make an improper evaluation called *projection,* a special kind of assumption wherein we conclude that a speaker or writer uses a term or refers to what we should be referring to were we using the term ourselves.

How will a realization of these factors affect the debater? First, the very awareness of the many uses of words as opposed to the one-and-only meaning should cause him to be more careful in his definitions. Second, it should impress upon him the importance of discovering how his adversary uses a particular term. At least he should be made aware that terms may be used differently under many circumstances and should not assume a common understanding.

Another tool of the debater is evidence. Evidence consists of facts and opinions which serve as the basis for inferences. As expressed by Alan Nichols:

> . . . every piece of proof consist of two parts: (1) the establishment of the evidentiary premise, or probans; and (2) a sequence of inferences leading to the proposition to be proved, or probandum. If this probandum is sound, two things must concur — the evidentiary premise must be true and the sequence of inferences leading from it to the probandum must be valid. The validity of inferences is studied under the head of reasoning; the question involved in establishing the probans as true or false, are the concern of evidence. But since the probans is generally supported by the testimony of an authority, the determination of whether the authority is mistaken or prejudiced or lying is germane to the inquiry. Thus under evidence we study the process involved in establishing the truth or falsity of the evidentiary premise, including the competency and credibility of authorities testifying to that premise.[15]

Sometimes the debater is not aware of the inadequacy of the facts

[15] *Ibid.,* 271-272.

upon which he draws his inferences. The various tests for the adequacy of evidence do not recognize that facts are-in-process.

Training in semantics should make a debater aware that the situation he evaluates is often in constant change, that he can become acquainted only partially with these facts. He cannot know all about them. This knowledge should cause the advocate to weigh his evidence with greater discrimination; to give first attention and weight to detailed first order descriptions. In learning not to confuse the levels of abstracting a debater should become increasingly diligent in his observation of the facts. Although he sees similarities he also sees the differences within the similarities. He can be made aware that his statements about these *facts* never represent *all* the facts. Thus training in semantics should make a debater more discriminating in his search and evaluation of evidence.

Reasoning consists of the inferences drawn from evidence. It consists of the passage from the known to the unknown. Reasoning is variously classified in textbooks on argumentation and logic. These books enumerate many tests for determining the validity of the reasoning process. Of primary concern is that of consistency and relevancy. In brief, reasoning concerns the way that factual statements of a speech are related. It consists largely of a set of rules for testing the relations between statements.

General semantics stresses the distinction between factual statements and inferences. Factual statements can only be made after observation of something non-verbal, while inferential statements may be made at any time and may go beyond what has been observed. Since inference statements are made from descriptive levels of abstraction they must be tentative and probable. While inference is a necessary part of human action the semanticist stresses the importance of knowing the difference between inference and fact and of not talking and acting as if inference is fact. An inference may also be made from another inference. The further removed the inference is from the fact the less likelihood of its validity. Thus, lower order inference are more reliable than higher order. Alfred Korzybski says:

> Here we may assume the generally accepted opinion that the reliability of inference depends on the reliability of the descriptive premises, and that description is more reliable than inference. In importance and in temporal and neurological natural order, description comes first; inference, next. If we con-

sider different orders of inferences, or inferential words, inferences or inferential words of lower order are more reliable and so more important than inferences of higher orders. . . .[16]

In habitual ordering his reactions with much greater emphasis upon materials at the bottom of the abstracting level, one would tend to be more concrete, specific, and less general. His reflections upon his materials become more thorough and more deliberate as should his conclusions than when merely inferential.

There are other tools used by the advocate wherein training in general semantics would make for improved evaluations. This paper discussed three. First through an awareness of the many uses of words the debater should realize the folly of the one-and-only meaning and thus exercise greater care in his definitions. Second, by a consciousness that facts are in constant change and that he cannot know all the facts he should weigh his evidence with greater discrimination. Third, by a knowledge of the different order of abstractions he should realize that high order inferences do not have the validity of abstractions on the descriptive level. If the methodology of general semantics is considered as complementary rather than antagonistic to the procedures of the debater, he may utilize such procedures in making his evaluation more adequate. Training in general semantics should make for improved debating.

---

[16]Korzybski, *op. cit.*, 479.

THE SOUTHERN AMERICAN DIPHTHONG [aɪ]

C. M. Wise,* W. Scott Nobles** and Herbert Metz**

[ɑ] for [aɪ]

There is a persistent tradition that the southern speaker substitutes [ɑ] for [aɪ]. He undoubtedly does so occasionally, particularly in the words *I* and *my;* other instances are known, as when *blond* was heard where *blind* was intended. But of the 6281 hearings from approximately 2400 pronunciations of [aɪ]-words in the study about to be reported, only one instance of [ɑ] appeared — this, as might have been expected, as a pronunciation of the pronoun *I.* Pending further investigation, it must be assumed that the [ɑ]-tradition is promoted and preserved, not so much by speakers as by writers of dialect, who conventionally use the spelling *a-h,* as in "Ah want some frahd chicken." Such writers are not usually phonetically trained, and so may not readily distinguish between the frequently used [a] for [aɪ] and the occasional [ɑ]; further, ordinary type-fonts provide no phonetic symbols, and since there is no convenient way of spelling [a] with orthographic symbols, *a-h* is the only recourse; still further, writers imitate each other, and often use conventional spellings for sounds which they never have heard personally, or which are merely invented (cf. "duh-h-h" as the tag for a dim-witted character). In any case, the single occurrence of [ɑ] in the present study calls for no further attention.

[a] for [aɪ]

The present study was undertaken as a check on the fairly common observation that [a] for [aɪ] occurs in the South finally and before voiced consonants, as in *fry* [fra] and *fried* [frad], while [aɪ] retains its integrity before voiceless consonants, as in *fright* [fraɪt]. The study began with a class exercise in a graduate-level course in Louisiana State University, where each of 17 students

---

*Professor and Chairman of the Speech Department, Louisiana State University; Former President of The Speech Association of America and Editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech;* Former President of The Southern Speech Association.

**Graduate Student in Speech, Louisiana State University.

transcribed 20 words from the speech of five informants selected by himself. The findings showed a trend in the direction indicated above, and it was decided to undertake a wider and more carefully planned study, with the following-described procedure:

The basic elements of the investigation were (1) a composition of three short paragraphs loaded with instances of the pertinent sound, (2) a tape recorder, and (3) 79 beginning speech students. The paragraphs consumed only one minute of recording time, but included 41 repetitions of the [aɪ]-sound. Of these only the stressed [aɪ]'s, 30 in number, were actually used in tabulation.

The students were screened for regional background and only those from southern states were used, most of them being life-long residents of Louisiana and Mississippi. Two students who used [aɪ] at all times were omitted from the original group of 81.

The students were handed the paragraphs to be recorded a few moments before the recording began. They were instructed to read naturally, with no attempt to achieve a rendition better than their habitual oral reading.

The material thus recorded was later heard and reheard by the three authors of this paper and the incidence of [aɪ] and [a] recorded by them on previously prepared sheets. As was expected, the judgments of the auditors did not in every instance agree. The disagreements occurred mainly where the second element of [aɪ] was light, so that there was a question whether to adjudge it heavy enough to allow the pronunciation to be classified with [aɪ], or light enough to be considered negligible and so to allow the pronunciation to be classified with [a]. There was not, however, a significantly great variation among the judgments, and since the deviations largely canceled each other out, the recordings of all three auditors were compiled together.

Here follows the material used, with the number of pronunciations of [aɪ] and [a], in that order, written after each word used in the tabulation.

This is a brief account of my life in the *United* (159-29) States Navy:

My first *assignment* (102-107) was to an officer training unit in a college program. There were *five* (82-126) of us sent there from the same school. It was *quite* (201-10) an academic *grind*

(122-97), but the military training was *light* (208-12). I remained there for *nine* (140-74) months and then was *assigned* (134-81) to midshipman's school in Chicago.

The academic instruction at this school was *highly* (94-120) concentrated. They managed to *find* (154-63) *time* (89-131), however, to arrange a *night* (194-19) *ride* (104-107) or two on the "*briny* (201-13) deep." *Nearby* (150-61) Lake Michigan was the best they had, but I learned, (at the *price* (180-35) of a terrible sickness), that it gets rough enough *right* (176-36) there.

Finally (177-32), I got my *stripe* (196-17) indicating the *high* (167-39) rank of ensign and was sent immediately overseas. I naturally took great *pride* (156-59) in my new importance. However, the first *unkind* (126-90) two-*striper* (195-7) whom I passed *by* (109-64) without saluting impressed upon me that ensigns were not men, but *mice* (202-13). I won't give *precise* (178-35) details of such early experiences; *suffice* (163-8) it to say that I learned that an ensign's *life* (183-28) is not all "the *life* (175-36) of *Riley*" (93-120).

It will be observed above that the pronouns *I* and *my* were omitted from consideration. The reason for the omission was that in most of the students' reading both pronouns were usually unstressed, and hence nearly always pronounced [a] and [ma]. Since these pronunciations are common in unstressings even in dialects where in stressed words [aɪ] is practically invariably used, it was necessary to exclude them. One instance of *life* was also excluded, since there were two others later in the reading. A number of individual pronunciations do not figure in the data because (1) a student would sometimes omit a word or (2) would mispronounce it completely (e.g., *two-stripper* for two-*striper*), or (3) an investigator would fail to record an occasional pronunciation.

Some results of the investigation appear as follows:

I. All Test-Words Grouped Together

No. judgments rendered on the pronunciations — 6281	
No. recordings of [aɪ]	4612 (73+%)
No. recordings of [a]	1669 (26+%)

II. Words with [aɪ] or [a] Final in the Syllable

	[aɪ]	[a]
United	159	29
highly	94	120
briny	201	13
nearby	152	61
finally	177	32
high	167	39
striper	195	7
by	109	64
Riley	93	120
Totals	1347 (73+%)	485 (26+%)

III. Words with [aɪ] or [a] before Voiced Consonant in the Same Syllable

	[aɪ]	[a]
assignment	102	107
five	82	126
grind	122	97
nine	140	74
assigned	134	81
find	154	63
time	89	131
ride	104	107
pride	156	59
unkind	126	90
Totals	1209 (56+%)	935 (43+%)

IV. Words with [aɪ] or [a] before Voiceless Consonant in the Same Syllable

	[aɪ]	[a]
quite	201	10
light	208	12
night	194	19
price	180	35
right	176	36
stripes	196	17
mice	202	13
precise	178	35
suffice	163	8
life	183	28
life	175	36
Totals	2056 (89+%)	249 (10+%)

It can readily be seen that the agreement of the pronunciations in the test with the conditions of the original hypothesis ([aɪ] before voiceless consonants in the same syllable, [a] before voiced consonants in the same syllable and finally in the syllable) is by no means uniform. Tabulation No. IV immediately above is the only one which conforms to any noteworthy degree; but even here, where [aɪ] is to be expected throughout, only 89% of the total number of pronunciations are heard as [aɪ], while individual words show [a] in from eight to 36 instances. Nevertheless, the tabulation shows a définite trend toward [aɪ] before voiceless consonants, even among speakers every one of whom uses [a] as a feature of his sound pattern.

In tabulations II and III, where, by the hypothesis, [a] is to be expected, no single word conforms completely, and only six words, *highly* ([aɪ]94-[a]120), *Riley* (93-120), *five* (82-126), *assignment* (102-107,, *time* (89-131), and *ride* (104-107), are pronounced oftener with [a] than with [aɪ]. With singular perversity, *high* (167-39) reverses the trend of *highly* (94-120).

With the exception of the six words listed above, every word in the tabulations is heard oftener with [aɪ] than with [a], with the grand total of 6281 instances standing at 73+% [aɪ]'s to 26+% [a]'s, despite the fact that according to the hypothesis, [a] should be expected with 20 of the test-words, and [aɪ] with only 10. A score in perfect conformation with the hypothesis, assuming every word to be duly pronounced by every student and unfailingly recorded by the auditors, would be 4029 [a]'s and 3111 [aɪ]'s, or 56+% [a]'s and 43+% [aɪ]'s, instead of the 26+% [a]'s and 73+% [aɪ]'s actually recorded.

The foregoing would appear to indicate that other factors than position finally or before voiced or voiceless consonants affect the pronunciation of the diphthong studied. One such factor may be stress. It has already been noted that unstressed *I* and *my* are, even outside the South, pronounced with [a]. In the present study these two words were so nearly always unstressed, and hence pronounced with [a] (sometimes even [ə]) that they had to be excluded to prevent their weighting unduly the findings on the stressed words. A careful rehearing of the recordings discussed herein seems to leave little doubt that the varying degrees of stress upon the words tabulated had a bearing on the choice between [aɪ] and [a]

in the oral reading. Words which were for any reason stressed showed a high incidence of the diphthong [aɪ], whereas those words given lesser stress inclined more toward [a].

Since the students were doing "cold" sight-reading, relatively unfamiliar words were often given undue stress. This was true of such words as *suffice* (163-8), *precise* (178-35), *briny*[1] (201-13), and *two-striper* (195-7). The stress given these words often exceeded that required to express the meaning of the text. While it must be admitted that three of these diphthongs are followed by voiceless consonants, the fact remains that the fourth, in *briny,* is not, and still has a very high incidence of [aɪ].

Again, when the meaning suggested strong stress on a word, the word was likely to be pronounced with [aɪ]. Thus *mice,* in a strong position, rates 202 [aɪ]'s to 13 [a]'s, whereas the highly comparable *price,* in a weak position, rates only 180 [aɪ]'s to 35 [a]'s. Likewise *pride,* in a strong position, rates 156 [aɪ]'s and 59 [a]'s while the comparable *ride,* in a weak position, rates only 104 [aɪ]'s to 107 [a]'s.

On the other hand, some factors that might be expected to affect the situation appear not to do so. For example, the [n] of *find* might be thought to induce the tongue to pass through the position of [ɪ] on the way from [a] to [n], and thus account for the high incidence of [aɪ] in the word — 154 [aɪ]'s to 63 [a]'s. But the [n] in *grind,* which apparently ought to function in exactly the same way, seemingly does not consistently do so, since the score is only 122 [aɪ]'s to 97 [a]'s. And this is in spite of the fact that *grind* is in the stronger stress-position, where [aɪ] might be expected to flourish. Likely still other factors are present, whose nature and function are not at once evident.

It is interesting to compare the situation of [aɪ] in the deep South today with its situation in other times and places. Benjamin Franklin, in 1768, records the diphthong of his time as the equivalent of [ʌi].[2] Whether this represents his Boston-Philadelphia

[1]The syllable divisions of dissyllables stressed on the first syllable are uniformly taken here as being between the vowel of the syllable and the following consonant. See syllabifications of these words in ACD.

[2]Jared Sparks, *The Works of Benjamin Franklin* (Boston, 1838), VI, 296-303.

[3]C. M. Wise, "Benjamin Franklin as a Phonetician," *Speech Monographs* V (1948), I, 99-120.

pronunciation or his London pronunciation is hard to say, since he was near the mid-point of a ten-year sojourn in London, which had been preceded by two other periods there totaling about five years. Franklin's correspondent on phonetic matters, Mary Stevenson, a Londoner, writes [ʌi] as well. But neither Franklin nor Miss Stevenson distinguishes between the pronunciation of the diphthong finally or followed by voiced consonants and that followed by voiceless consonants. *Vide*

Franklin: *by* [bʌi], *rides* [rʌidz], *might* [mʌit]
Stevenson: *I* [ʌi], *acquire* [ækwʌir], *might* [mʌit]

A. J. Ellis,[3] writing in 1869, a full century after Franklin, records the diphthong as [əi] (the paleotype symbols probably are to be interpreted as IPA [ɜɪ]), and labels it "usual English." He makes no distinction among the pronunciations of the diphthong in *eye* [əi], *time* [təim] and *paleotype* [pæliotəip].

Edwin F. Shewmake,[4] writing in 1927 on the speech of Virginia, formulates "laws" for the use of what he records as [ɑ-i] and *uh*-[i] (IPA [ɑɪ] or [aɪ] and [ʌɪ] or [ɜɪ]) in terms very similar to those of the hypothesis considered in this paper. Thus:

[ʌɪ] is used
1. Before a voiceless consonant in the same syllable, as in *bright* [brʌɪt], *wife* [wʌɪf].
2. Before an unstressed syllable composed of a voiceless consonant plus [ə], as in *hyphen* ['hʌɪfən], *vital* ['vʌɪtəl].

[aɪ] is used
1. Finally, as in *fly* [flaɪ], *alibi* ['æləbaɪ].
2. Before a vowel, as in *bias* ['baiəs], *myopia* [ˌmaɪ'oʊpɪə].
3. Before a voiced consonant in the same syllable, as in file [faɪl], *wives* [waɪvz].
4. Before a syllable beginning with a voiced consonant, as in *finality* [ˌfaɪ'nælətɪ], *ivy* ['aɪvɪ].
5. Before a stressed syllable beginning with a voiceless consonant, as in *vitality* [ˌvaɪ'tælətɪ].

In present-day New England, specifically on the off-shore islands of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard, on the eastern tip of Long Island, on Cape Cod, and along the coast north of Massachu-

[3]Alexander J. Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, Part II (London, 1869), 1 and 5.

[4]Edwin Francis Shewmake, *English Pronunciation in Virginia*, doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1920, pub. 1927, 24-25.

setts, *The Linguistic Atlas*[5] records a pronunciation closely resembling that found in Virginia, viz. [ɐɪ] (variant [ʌɪ]). However, those who use it indicate no variation in it, whether found finally, before a voiced consonant or before a voiceless consonant: thus *side road* [sɐɪd] (I-1, 44), *turnpike* [pɐɪk, pʌɪk] (I-1, 42), *wife* [wɐɪf] (II-2, 35). This pronunciation is used alongside [aɪ] and variants thereof, which likewise are used indiscriminately in all the positions listed above.

Closer to the present study than any of the foregoing references are the conclusions of Harry S. Wise, who in 1937 wrote a Master's thesis on the same problem.[6] He states:

It was found . . . that of 1714 [aɪ]-words pronounced by the [17] subjects, 1067 were pronounced with the diphthong [aɪ] or one of its variants, and 358 with the vowel [a] or closely allied variants. . . . From the accumulated data, the following may be deduced:
1. That the basic form of the diphthong is [aɪ].
2. That some pure vowel . . . constitutes a strong contender for dominance of the phoneme.
3. That no individual speaker adheres consistently either to a diphthongal or a pure-vowel form of the phoneme. . . .
4. That in the words *I, my, I'll, I've, I'd* and *I'm,* the pure vowel dominates — 90 out of 108 occurrences in the study.
5. That in *mine* the diphthong dominates — 28 out of 38 times used in the study.
6. *That the phoneme shows fewer variants before voiceless consonants than before voiced consonants.*[7]
7. That the reverse is true after voiceless and voiced consonants.

Of all these, only Shewmake's study on Virginia pronunciation and Wise's thesis on Louisiana pronunciation exhibit variants governed by final position and by position in relation to voiced and voiceless consonants. The Virginia data thus tend in some measure to point up the validity of the postulate respecting the alternation of [aɪ] and [a] in Louisiana and other parts of the deep South; the thesis data do so more positively. But both the thesis and the study reported in this paper show a little more than a trend, strong

[5]*The Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada,* I-II, *The Linguistic Atlas of New England,* Hans Kurath, Editor (Brown University, 1939).

[6]Harry Stephen Wise, *A Phonetic Study of the Southern American Diphthong* /aɪ/ *Phoneme* (Louisiana State University, 1937), I-II of Abstract.

[7]*Italics ours.*

in respect to [aɪ] before a voiceless consonant, weak and uneven elsewhere.

One might postulate that the language of the southern region is for some reason entering a period of [a] for [aɪ]; or, conversely, that it is emerging from one. The records of the past are too scant to allow us to say which it is; but some interested linguist fifty or one hundred years hence, may, on seeing this article and making comparison with the pronunciation of his own time, be able to make a valid judgment.

THE HEARING OF CHILDREN: FACTS AND FALLACIES

JACK L. BANGS* *and* TINA E. BANGS**

Most of the fallacies which are to be discussed in this paper have been exposed in the last decade as a direct result of improvements in electronic amplification used under controlled conditions for diagnostic and remedial procedures with the aurally handicapped. The present day amplifier is bringing many so called "deaf" children into a hearing world, and through the myriads of research problems pursued and questions answered, is creating a new, complex, and useful group of scientists called audiologists. Their work is so new that they find it difficult to keep pace with the multitude of current concepts or the bodies of discarded ones. They have, however, been active in the pursuit of more information about hearing, and during their investigations many of the ideas accepted for years have been shown to be based on meager, inadequate, or non-existent evidence. Some of these adages have arisen from the doctors associated with the children involved; others are simply nostrums; while others are learned daily over the back fence or bridge hand. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss a few of the fallacies which are related to the hearing problems of children and to present evidence that is more factual.

Among the most frequently heard fallacies is found the categorical statement that accurate hearing tests cannot be made on children under six years of age or at the least five. This fallacy has grown out of the average, poorly controlled office testing situation where the psychological trauma of just being in a doctor's office is usually enough to insure poor rapport. One technician is unable to handle the child or cannot spend the time. If a youngster were cooperative, other factors such as street and office noises present masking problems which make for unreliable test results.

The fact is that modern, well equipped, well staffed audiologic clinics are capable of making accurate hearing tests on pre-school youngsters. Conditioned response techniques utilizing such devices as the pediacoumeter have provided a reliable means of testing the hearing acuity of children as young as two years and sometimes

*Director, Houston Speech and Hearing Center, Houston, Texas.
**Assistant Director, Houston Speech and Hearing Center, Houston, Texas.

younger. It is true that such tests take time, patience, training, and special instruments, but the value of accurate diagnosis of hearing losses at these very early ages is indisputable.

In addition to having successful techniques for testing children in this age range, there is in use in many Centers a psycho galvanic skin reception test which is applicable to youngsters under two years of age as well as older children and adults. Although reports of the reliability and validity of this test vary with the researcher, it is reasonable to believe that in the near future we will have as much confidence in it as we now have with standard pure tone techniques. The fact is, when tests are available, it is inexcusable to delay the exploration of the extent and nature of a child's hearing loss until he reaches the age of six years.

If a severely hard of hearing child has not been adequately tested, he more often than not is categorized as "deaf." Many audiologists now feel that this term is too strong because it implies, as does "blind," the total lack of responses from the sense organ. The writers believe it fallacious to use the term "deaf" unless it can be demonstrated that there is no residual hearing at any frequency. Too many Schools for the Deaf are training children through avenues other than hearing because of a lack of information relative to the hearing threshold. Statistics now indicate that less than 3.5% of the children in Schools for the Deaf have no residual hearing. The remainder could profit in varying degrees from amplification, but are being denied the opportunity because they have been classified as "deaf." The fact is, most so-called "deaf" children are hard of hearing.

Once amplification has been considered, a number of fallacious reports are made which confuse the teacher, therapist, and parents. Among the first of these is the commonly quoted statement that amplification will injure young childrens' ears. It is difficult to trace the origin of this remark, but possibly it grows out of the fact that most severely hard of hearing children when given amplification at Schools for the Deaf or similar instructional Centers, reject most violently the ear phones. Their main complaint is that it hurts their ears.

It is true that poor quality amplification applied to childrens' ears before tolerance levels have been determined and built up will probably cause them to reject the ear phones and complain that

their ears hurt. The modern amplifier employing compression amplification enables the teacher of auditory training to keep sounds well within the child's tolerance levels if she knows two things: the extent of the child's loss and the amount of output of the amplification system in terms of acoustic power in decibels at the child's ears. If a youngster were subjected to poorly controlled amplification where transient sounds reached levels of about 90 db or greater for long periods of time, permanent injury to the nerve or end organ might occur. Most children would not listen to intolerably loud sounds; therefore, the writers believe that there is little likelihood of permanent injury.

Another fallacy related to amplification is the thought expressed by some people that if a hearing aid is worn, the nerve will not develop. This idea arises from the belief that the hearing aid will do all the hearing thus allowing the auditory nerve to degenerate. Fortunately this belief is beginning to lose credence as a direct result of public education.

On the opposite side of the ledger is the fallacy that a hearing aid actually improves a child's hearing nerve. There is little doubt that intelligibility as measured by ability to learn to identify sound effects or words improves with auditory training. Children who have always ignored sounds around the house suddenly begin to notice them after a short training period and parents report that their youngsters are hearing better. Although the sounds have become meaningful and are no longer ignored, there is no proof that a neuro-physiological improvement has taken place; and audiometric retests will show no threshold shift. The main objection to this fallacy lies in arousing false hopes on the part of parents who interpret this to mean that their child's hearing may improve enough to discard the hearing aid.

On the other hand, parents often falsely believe that if their child is provided with a hearing aid, he will suddenly begin to talk. Related to this fallacy is the additional thought that it makes no difference what kind of amplification a child gets as long as he hears something. The simplest analogy to the first mistaken idea is that of learning a foreign language. One does not hear a word of Russian and suddenly understand the meaning, but rather, the association of what is heard with the object itself must be made through

education or training. The same holds true for the child when he first wears his hearing aid; he hears, but cannot understand.

The second suggestion, that any kind of amplification is satisfactory is equally falacious. Insufficient power as well as poor frequency response can result in lack of intelligibility, and as mentioned previously, a signal that is too strong for long periods of time may injure the hearing mechanism or cause the child to reject his instrument. The fact is that successful usage of a hearing aid by a child is dependent upon adequate testing, selection, and training.

Another fallacy is related to speech reading or lipreading which has been the main tool in the education of the deaf. Many teachers have believed and still do believe that auditory training hinders the teaching of lipreading. This concept, no doubt, gained stronger recognition after the publication of an Association Committee report on Speech Reading in Schools for the Deaf, 1942. This committee was concerned about the effects of acoustic training on speech reading. Since the publication of this statement, research studies have demonstrated better comprehension of language when both the avenues of sight and hearing are utilized rather than one or the other alone.

The writers have presented a brief summary of some of the most well established fallacies surrounding the hearing of the so-called "deaf" child, and have attempted to provoke thoughtful disagreement with these concepts. It appears from the literature that much of the factual information already obtained has been largely dependent upon the modern amplifier whether it be the group unit, the modern hearing aid, or the audiometer.

EDUCATIONAL THEATRE: A DEFINITION

F. LOREN WINSHIP*

The nation's first drama department was founded only four decades ago at Carnegie Institute of Technology by T. W. Stevens. Since 1914 many universities, colleges, and public schools have introduced theatre courses into their curricula, and during this brief period scholastic theatre has been accepted as a major field of study by a slowly increasing number of colleges and secondary schools. The importance of establishing effective educational theatre programs at all academic levels was clearly set forth in the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Dr. Francis H. Horn, former Executive Secretary of Higher Education for the National Education Association, reported that

> The theatre is a potent educational and cultural force, but in America it is denied to the vast majority of our people. Drama, the harmonizer of the arts and perhaps the greatest of the arts, has been shamefully neglected. It is time we recognized its importance to all people and created conditions in which a great national theatre can flourish. In this challenging task, a major responsibility rests upon the schools and colleges.[1]

Despite the efforts of Stevens and others, the educational theatre still occupies an insignificant position in more than one-half of our universities and public schools. This situation exists primarily because there is a general misunderstanding of the scope, comprehensiveness, and educational potential of dramatics. An understanding of the scholastic theatre depends largely upon the ability of those who teach drama to formulate an acceptable philosophy of educational theatre from which its basic objectives can be derived and defined.

Educational theatre is a term which has varying connotations for different persons, and it is peculiarly susceptible to misunderstanding. The typical public school administrator thinks of it as an extracurricular activity related to "putting on the junior and

---

*Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Drama, University of Texas; Managing Editor of *Educational Theatre Journal;* Former President of Nebraska Speech Association.

[1]U. S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, *Fine Arts Programs in Colleges Bill,* House of Representatives Report 2428, to accompany H. R. 7494, 82nd Cong., 2d Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1952.

senior class plays." Most teachers, including too many of those who direct such productions, share this superficial concept of school dramatics. Some college and university speech instructors still accept the philosophy that theatre is a part of the "speech family." In recent years certain educators who are apparently convinced that educational theatre should be considered as a liberal arts subject have classified it in the general field of communications along with journalism, literature, speech, English, radio, and foreign languages. Some teachers think of educational theatre as a device to be used primarily for improving the cultural level and to motivate the literary understanding of their students. There are still those to whom the theatre is an immoral activity, sinful, wasteful of time and effort, and contrary to Biblical law and commandment. Finally, there are some persons who accept generally the definition of educational theatre which is based upon the teachings of George Pierce Baker, T. W. Stevens, and other pioneers in this field.

There may be minor differences in the definitions which specialists in educational theatre apply to the term. However, there is unanimity of opinion among them concerning the comprehensiveness of the art of theatre, and there is complete agreement that drama is a creative art. Cheney emphasized this point when he stated

> But the man who wishes to bring the whole picture into focus, who hopes to have the view complete, finds it necessary to see beyond all these [acting, lights, dialogue, movement, noises, silences, color, scenery, stage] to a deeper design that binds the picture together, to a thing that is 'theatre' in the largest sense.[2]

Gordon Craig, one of the most noted scholars of the modern theatre, expressed his conception of the totality of theatre training in these words.

> The art of theatre is neither acting nor the play, it is not the scene nor dance, but it consists of all elements of which these things are comprised. . . . One is no more important than the other.[3]

Contemporary writers in the field of educational theatre have repeatedly stressed the need to realize that the art of the theatre is a creative art which includes all other arts, that it relates itself to the various ramifications of the sciences and the humanities, and

---

[2]Sheldon Cheney, *The Theatre: Three Thousand Years of Drama, Acting, and Stagecraft* (New York, 1935), 2.

[3]Gordon Craig, *On the Art of the Theatre* (London, 1911), 138.

that it is an art which exerts an influence upon every aspect of human behavior.

The universal appeal of the theatre to man's deepest instincts is clearly presented by John Gassner in the preface of his excellent work on the history of the drama. His book was

> . . . an attempt to pay homage to one of the greatest mediums of human expression. It regards the drama as a comprehensive art that is inalienable from civilization. The drama arose out of fundamental human needs in the dawn of civilization . . . and levies tribute upon all the arts. . . .[4]

How, then, shall educational theatre be defined? Perhaps it may be defined most completely by describing briefly the principal objectives which any effective program of scholastic theatre includes.

Modern educational theatre is a creative, practical activity. Its participants learn to do by doing those scores of tasks which are required of them as they are taught the art of play production. They learn to think independently because the development of individual thought and action is one of the basic elements of play production. They learn to appreciate the dignity of human labor because the theatre demands a great amount of human labor. They learn to master the techniques of handling tools, needles, pigment, electrical equipment, paint, lumber, and cloth. They learn to sell advertising and tickets, to make and upholster furniture, and to launder clothing. They draw upon their knowledge of mathematics, physich, speech, art, Journalism, music, English, history, homemaking, industrial arts, and foreign languages, and combine all these as they work together to produce a single play.

Modern educational theatre is a creative, culturally enriching activity. The theatre has always given to the peoples of every era a representation of their deeds, their aspirations, and their cultural and aesthetic accomplishments. In the theatre the lives of the most noble and the most despicable of men have been portrayed. The theatre has sought to reveal the truth about each age in which it has existed. As a cultural art it has fed the artistic and creative hunger of multitudes. It takes from each of the arts the aesthetic qualities which give the theatre such universal appeal. The theatre has become a part of the cultural inheritance of civilization because it depends upon the human element to a greater extent than any other art form. No civilized race has become great or has long

[4]John Gassner, *Masters of the Drama* (New York, 1945), xvii-xviii.

maintained greatness whose peoples have lacked a highly developed creative spirit. American schools have the responsibility of fostering the growth of a kind of theatre which will encourage the development of the highest type of creative spirit.

Participants in theatre learn to appreciate the great literary masterpieces of such authors as Moliere, Shakespeare, Goethe, Shaw, O'Neill, and Wilder because the works of these writers must be thoroughly studied and understood if they are to be brought to life on the stage. An appetite for good literature is created, and a motivation for literary appreciation is strongly established by the requisites of play production.

Modern educational theatre is a creative, democratic activity. Students learn the principles of democracy and civic responsibility because these are inherent in an effective educational theatre program. Working together in close harmony as members of a play company, establishing the espirit de corps which occurs so naturally during rehearsal periods, assuming responsibilities as crew members, coordinating all work projects to meet a deadline, settling with tolerance and understanding the differences of opinion and procedure which are always present in a free society, learning to command and to be commanded: these are aspects of functional democracy and community leadership which are encountered daily by all who work in play production. Such an activity makes a definite contribution to the improvement of democratic processes of the community.

> To summarize the whole matter (values of dramatics to the community) in a single concluding sentence, it can be said that, since dramatic presentations are living reflections of life itself requiring the co-operation of all community agencies in an active and receptive manner, all the citizens of a community can gain improved cultural, social, and political values from them. The possibility of realizing this outcome is one of the greatest challenges of the school theatre.[5]

There are no "stars" in a well organized educational theatre. Today's leading man may be scrubbing scenery tomorrow. The girl who sewed the hooks and eyes on Portia's costume yesterday may be rehearsing the role of Hedda Gabler tonight. The student develops and maintains his individualistic identity at the same time

---

[5]Lawrence D. Smith, "Values to the Community," *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals,* XXXIII (December, 1949), 22.

that he learns to subordinate his individualism for the well being of the group. He will also be encouraged to develop fully those special aspirations, talents, and capabilities which originally caused him to select the theatre as his profession or as his avocation.

Here is training in worthwhile citizenship in a democracy and in the kind of leadership that recognizes the worth of the contribution of each individual in the group and the interdependence of each upon all.[6]

Modern educational theatre is a creative activity which has personal and therapeutic values. The student develops such qualities as self confidence, poise, cooperativeness, initiative, resourcefulness, self control and self discipline, and a sense of understanding and appreciation of the abilities and efforts of others. He learns the importance of systematic organization, orderly procedure, and detailed planning because even the most casual type of play production encourages and requires the development of organizational abilities. The student in the educational theatre experiences strongly the feeling of belonging, he is provided with a controlled outlet for the physical, emotional, and mental disturbances which seem common to many young people. He discovers through dramatics a more definite purpose for staying in school and an acceptable reason for giving closer attention to other scholastic pursuits. In play production he finds an opportunity to expend excess energy in a constructive and educationally productive way, to develop his imagination, and to use his leisure hours to better advantage.

Modern educational theatre is a creative activity which has definite vocational possibilities. One of the reasons for the increase in the number of collegiate theatre departments has been the demand for public school and university teachers of theatre.

The best evidence of how far high school dramatics had moved in the past few years comes from the universities. Their work in drama and their work in producing are almost entirely consecrated to turning out teachers.[7]

The primary objective of the Department of Theatre Arts at the University of California at Los Angeles was set forth by its chairman in 1946.

. . . the fundamental purpose [of the theatre department] must be to give students a liberal education in the arts, letters, and sciences, and at the same

[6] Mary T. McGrath, "The Place of Dramatic Arts in the Secondary Schools," *Ibid,* 8.

[7] Kenneth MacGowan, *Footlight Across America* (New York, 1929), 171.

time to relate this education to concentrated study in a special field. Like the rest of the universities U. C. L. A. recognizes that its task is not to compete with dramatics schools . . . but to develop and equip teachers.[8]

Most of the universities which established modern departments of theatre have adopted similar objectives with respect to the vocation of teaching drama.

And such a career is indeed the ultimate aim of a great, and increasing, number of students. They intend to become teachers of dramatic literature; will impart to the generation of tomorrow not merely the knowledge of dramatic art in all its manifold aspects, but also — and this is the essential point — a concept of theatre.[9]

Educational theatre exists also for the purpose of giving training to those students who seek careers in television, community and professional theatre, and the motion picture industry. A few have the necessary talent, courage, luck, and persistence to succeed in securing employment in some branch of the commercial theatre. The college theatre has contributed a large number of well known actors, directors, playwrights, and designers to the professional theatre, and there is always a percentage of each degree class which "goes to New York."

Thus, the educational theatre is a creative segment of academic life which becomes more than an extracurricular activity, more than a medium of entertainment, more than the mere production of a class play, more than a few survey courses in the curriculum or a minor phase of some integrated or combination program. Educational theatre is one of the fine arts comprising that part of the scholastic order which provides for the student vocational opportunities that annually increase in number. It supplies many practical, utilitarian, educational experiences which the student can easily transfer to his adult life. It furnishes cultural enrichment at a time in our history when cultural values are seriously threatened by a materialistic, pragmatic, scientific civilization. It provides actual experience in practicing democratic principles of living which increases his potential worth to his community. It supplies personal and therapeutic values for the student which give him greater emotional and mental stability and which enhance his chances to

[8]Kenneth MacGowan, "New Arts Go to College," *Theatre Arts Monthly,* XXXI (July, 1947), 51.

[9]Henry Schnitzler, "The Educational Theatre Faces a Challenge," *San Francisco Quarterly,* XIII (1948), Reprint.

provide an adequate living for himself and his dependents. He can find somewhere in the diversified intricacies of play production an opportunity to use all his talents and capabilities. Each of his needs is met in the educational theatre because of the scope and comprehensiveness of its program.

There may be some teachers who criticize this definition on the grounds that it claims too many values for participation in play production. A few may even agree with the statement which appeared in a recently published text that

> . . . the purpose of drama in the high school is primarily to improve the every day talk of students.[10]

On the other hand there are some experienced teachers producing plays at secondary and collegiate levels who will argue that there is an even greater number of benefits and values which accrue to those who participate in the educational theatre.

It is not our purpose to place educational theatre in a false position by claiming for it attributes which are not generally recognized by those thoroughly acquainted with play production at secondary and collegiate levels. Neither is it intended to accept the paltry purpose quoted above.

Our primary purpose is to encourage the instructor in educational theatre at all academic levels to establish and define for himself objectives that are based upon a sound workable philosophy which can be understood and appreciated by high school and university administrators. Educational theatre will become an effective part of school curricula only when the teachers of its many phases realize its scope and potentialities and unite in an effort which will permit it to make its full contribution to American society.

---

[10]A. T. Weaver, G. L. Borchers, and D. K. Emith, *The Teaching of Speech* (New York, 1952), 438.

TEACHING SPEECH AND THEATER IN THE UNIVERSITIES OF THAILAND

HAROLD WEISS*

On May 16, 1952, I left the shores of the U.S.A. to depart for Bangkok, Thailand, where I was to spend the year as a Fulbright Professor. Most of the readers probably know the routine. Many of the countries of the world were aided by the United States during the past war. We gave them millions of dollars worth of surplus material. They are paying for these surplus materials in the following manner: each country which so desires has signed a contract with the United States Government promising to match certain funds, allocated by it, for professorships, research, and student exchange.

A Fulbright Professor receives his transportation from the United States Government. He also receives a small amount of American dollars to pay for taxes and fixed charges here in the United States. The remainder of the stipend is paid in the currency of the nation to which he is assigned. In my case it was *ticals,* the currency of Thailand. My assignment was to teach Speech, English, and Drama to the students of Chulalongkorn University in Bangkok.

All Siamese students who have passed what corresponds to our sixth grade study the English language. They must pass an examination in English, written and oral, before they can enter Chulalongkorn University. However, their experience with the spoken language is usually quite meager and, added to their natural shyness and almost painful respect for professors, it is very difficult to get any speech work accomplished. Materials for instruction are almost non-existent. The student comes to class armed with pencil and paper prepared to write down, not notes, but *every single word* the instructor speaks aloud.

My classes were distributed as follows: half the freshman class in the Faculty of Arts (about 80 students) were handed over to me for "conference in English." This meant about 10 to 12 students

*Professor and Chairman, Department of Speech and Theater, Southern Methodist University; Former President of The Southern Speech Association.

per group, each group meeting once a week. I had a section (the entire fourth-year class of the Arts Faculty — about 47 students) in American Literature and in Modern Drama, one meeting each a week. I taught the fourth-year Faculty of Accountancy "English Texts" one meeting per week. (I should mention that "Faculty" corresponds to "school" or "college" here.) Then I was directed to take over two classes in English Conversation, one of law students and one of business students, in the University of Moral and Political Sciences. These met once a week and had more than a hundred students enrolled in each. You can imagine the embarrassment involved in trying to teach a section this size "English conversation."

Sometimes it seemed to me the scheduling of classes of UMPS was somewhat capricious. I came to class the first two weeks to find that "no group had been scheduled yet," although the university had been in session for over a month. My third arrival found an empty room. The wrong date had been put on the bulletin board. My fourth attempt was just as vain. It was a holiday, but nobody had thought to tell *me* about it. I was ready to give up, but on my fifth visit I discovered 185 boys and girls crowded into the large room. Some were legitimate students, but a big share were merely visitors and free-riders come to inspect the new professor. Of course, I had no class roll and no means of knowing the students from the visitors. It was quite an hour! When I arrived in the class room, everyone stood at attention. I signaled them to be seated and those who had seats occupied them. The others draped themselves against the walls or in the large windows on both sides of the room. Since I was supposed to be teaching conversation, I started right off. Jumping off the podium, I approached the first row and asked the first boy his name. He came smartly to attention and then began to look uneasily about him. I repeated the question and from all around him came excited whispers in Siamese. He finally caught his cue and mumbled something. It took me about two minutes to extract his age. I then went on to the next student. In this manner I covered almost a single row before the period ended. When I left the room I was followed by a throng of eager boys. I did not know whether they were welcoming me or considering a lynching, Siamese-style. Finally I turned and faced them. The spokesman

pushed forward. He bowed and, gesturing to the 30 or 40 boys who had followed him, looked at me pleadingly and begged, "Will you *converse* wit us next time?" And thus began my teaching experience at UMPS!

The Country

Thailand (Siam) is such an exotic country and so little-known by Westerners that a few facts about the land might not be amiss.

Siam is about the size of Texas. It has a population of 17 million.

Since 1932, it has been a constitutional monarchy. The present king is Phumipon Aduldet, about 24 years old. His queen is a charming young lady. While we were in Siam, an heir was born to the queen occasioning a three-day holiday.

As a matter of fact, the government is a military dictatorship under the nominal premiership of Field Marshal Pibun Songgram. The real dictator is General Phao, vice-premier and head of the police.

The climate is tropical; mean temperature is about 80 degrees. Food is plentiful. Rice-growing provides most of the food; the "klongs," (canals) and rivers teem with fish. Most of the Siamese eat rice and curry three times a day.

The religion is Buddhist — which means that the people are content with their lot. They believe they were born into their status. If they obey the Buddhist laws and "make sufficient merit," they will be raised in status during a future life. Most of the men go into the monastic life for part of their days. They take the yellow robe, shave off their hair and eyebrows, sleep on the ground, beg for their food, live in the wats (temples). However, they may leave the priesthood any time they please, and usually do after a short period of time. Although the Siamese are quite religious, they do not believe in God nor attend church services. Their major commandments are similar to the decalogue of Christianity.

The Thai (which means "free") are small people and although there is an abundance of food, they are by and large anemic because of their dependence on polished rice as the main article of food.

Universities

Chulalongkorn, established in 1917, was the first university to be founded in Thailand. It was at first a Royal Pages school founded B.E. 2445 (A.D. 1902). Now there are faculties of Arts, Architecture, Commerce and Accountancy, Political Science, and Science and Engineering.

The fees run about an average of 200 ticals a year, (about 10 dollars); broken down as follows: library fees, lab fees, breakage deposit, and health fees. Examination fees are about $1.00 for all courses.

The buildings are in Siamese style, with the interlocking roofs of colorful tile, decorated with the "naga" or sacred snake. On the first landing is a full-size portrait of King Chulalongkorn. The students make obeisance to this as they pass.

There are about 1500 students in Chula. I received an office of my own in which I held my "conference" classes. My office was large, with enormous shutters — but no glass windows. A fine set of new furniture was sent over, but I never could rid my desk of a large colony of ants.

The Faculty and Decorum

The chairman of the Department of Modern Languages was Prince Prem Purachatra, also editor of The Standard, the only English-language magazine in the country. He was tremendously interested in drama, having written quite a few plays in English. When the Debating Society of Chulalongkorn was revived, after being dormant many years because of the war, Prince Prem asked me to deliver the first lecture. He suggested Bernard Shaw and the play *Arms and the Man*. Of course, I complied. Then after my lengthy dissertation on the great Irishman, Prince Prem took over and wittily chatted about personal conferences and discussions with Mr. Shaw which *he*, the prince, had had in England. It took all my ingenuity to grab the spotlight again.

We were entertained lavishly by the faculty and students of the universities. It was at UMPS, about a week after our arrival, that we had our first "Chinese dinner"! The three Fulbright Professors and my wife were guests of honor. Three round tables were brought

in, and after ceremonious bowing, we were seated. About nine courses were served, and we did our best with the chopsticks provided. Of course, there were little china spoons for the sharksfin soup and other delicacies, but for the mushrooms, Szechuan duck, spiced fish, etc., it was chopsticks exclusively. I stole furtive glances at the table at which my wife presided. She was filled with consternation, having filled her bowl with a type of food she disliked. One of the Siamese saw her plight. He reached over and dumped the remains of her dish on the table. It's customary at Chinese dinners!

The students love party-giving too. We were immediately swung into the social whirl. Not only did we attend the parties, but I found myself in demand as a consultant on entertainment. At the freshman party, my senior group put on a Western act with guitars, square dancing, and jeanclad cowboys! (I should mention that the ten-gallon hats were made of straw.)

Students in Siam are polite — almost painfully so. They rise, of course, when a teacher enters the room. They rise when the class is completed . . . and they always wait until the teacher leaves before they escape from the classroom. When they meet their professor on campus or elsewhere they greet him with the "wai." This consists of putting the hands together in front of the face in the prayer position and bowing low. It is most impressive. They love to bring gifts to their teachers. We had been teaching only two days when a group of fifteen wound their way to our home one Sunday to "pay their respects." They brought with them a tremendous basket of exotic Siamese fruits. At Christmas, New Year's, and birthdays, all of one's classes and many individuals bring presents. For once my wife had more orchids than she could honestly appreciate.

The students in the universities wear a sort of uniform, but it has become less and less compulsory. All the girls wear a royal blue skirt and a white blouse, but the length and style of skirt varies from girl to girl, and the style of blouse does too. No stockings are worn, and shoes are only used to get from class to class during the dry season. The boys wear their white uniforms only on special days. Never have I seen a Siamese student come to class with a soiled shirt or blouse. I believe it is imperative that the garments be freshly washed before being worn to school

Naturally, I had to direct a play at Chulalongkorn. I decided to give a typically American play and to do it in "the round." Everyone was quite excited and my cast was quickly chosen — not by me — but by the head girl in the class! And she knew what she was doing. A great problem arose concerning the dead canary needed as a "prop" for the play. Buddhists never slay birds! A solution was effected, eventually. One of my students told me, "Chuan is a Christian; he was the executioner." I had been mildly protesting that a piece of yellow silk would have been sufficient . . . but students the world over love realism. The play might have been a success. We'll never know. About the time the audience was seated, dignitaries introduced, house lights turned off, play begun, boys came in all the doors loaded with trays of soft drinks. The drinks fell off the trays, rolled down the aisles, crashed on to the playing area.

Basic Findings

I did discover a few truths concerning the teaching of speech in the Far East. In the first place, the teaching of speech as a standard discipline in the universities and colleges of the Far East is practically unknown. They do not teach speech to their classes in native language and they do not use it in their English teaching. Such fields as drama, radio-TV, corrective speech, etc. are all "shocking innovations."

While English is becoming the second language of the greatest share of the Far East outside the bamboo curtain, the schools emphasize reading and writing. The students do their speech and conversational instruction outside the school — usually by private instructor. The teaching of English is important; it may bring a great mass of doubtful people into our orbit. But phonetics, semantics, group dynamics, all the elements of communication, should be incorporated into the teaching of English as a foreign language.

Toward International Understanding

The class load of a foreign professor in Siam runs about twelve hours a week. Each class, however, meets once a week only. This means the student sometimes carries 17 classes a semester. Nat-

urally, you can expect little preparation from class period to class period. In English, the students of the universities have one hour a week for grammar, one hour a week for composition, one hour a week for "conference," which means conversation, and one hour a week in English phonetics. These, of course, besides literature. They are evaluated entirely by final examination, both oral and written. The people of Thailand are aware of the necessity of learning English as a second language. Thailand has an ancient culture resplendent with great literary works, drama and poetry. But modern life, with its industry, science and technology, requires communication with the nations of the world in a language which has become the universal language of commerce — English — and especially American English. Students in Thailand of the *Pratom* (elementary) and *Mathayom* (secondary) schools study English for at least six years, but when they reach the University or take up positions in the civil service, the army, the school system, or in business, they feel the need for a new kind of English — not the language of the book or the composition paper, but conversation and the ability to listen to and understand those who speak with a facility, speed, and conversational intonation of the native-born. They yearn for the fluency of speech that marks the unruffled speaker and allows his thoughts full flight. This was *my* objective in the universities, and for those who did not attend universities, this criterion became the object of the American Alumnae Association Language Center in Bangkok.

The Language Center was an interesting phenomenon. A school of 760 students, it includes Thai citizens from all walks of life. There were doctors, lawyers, army, navy and air-force personnel, teachers, nurses, and employees of the various ministries. In a nation intensely class-conscious, where there are numerous titles of nobility, these learners dropped their identity as VIP's and adopted willingly the roles of students. The director once warned a class of high army officers, "Remember, there are no 'colonels' in this class room. You are all 'misters.'" They retaliated the following week by commissioning *him* as an honorary colonel. The classes of the A.U.A. center are held in an exotic area. Across from the Siamese Grand Palace, new class rooms were built around a court which once housed the theater of King Rama VI. The theater is still used as a clubhouse for the Language Center. Sunday mornings

and at Fair time, the gardens are transformed into a popular market where fruits, cloths, meat, vegetables, and native crafts are sold while the populous promenades in Sunday garments. A band plays in the center of the market and the area is far removed from the academic pursuits.

The teaching methods used are almost entirely oral. The phonetic orthography is an adaptation from the linguistic research of Smith and Trager. Certain vowel nuclei are taught, thus *ay* stands for the vowel sounds in "my," "fine," "why," "lie," "signs;" *aw* is the symbol representative of the vowel sound in "house," "how," "plow," etc. Consonantal sounds are simplified thus č represents the first consonant sound in "chair," "cheek," "Chain." Stress and degree of stress are indicated by symbols. Intonation is clearly marked for all phases. The idea that American English is a definitely patterned language in regard to intonation is exploited. Students are asked to "imitate the instructor's English," speaking loudly and trying to match the instructor's rhythm and timing, as well as his pronunciation of individual vowels and consonants.

The sounds difficult to Thai students are re-stressed. More drill is used with the objective of making correct usage automatic. Such sounds as the *a* in *day, stay,* etc., the differences between *s* and *z* form an introduction to the various lessons. The fact that English sentences are read in waves or phrases rather than word by word is pointed out and fixed in habit by constant repetitive drill. Grammatical principles are introduced functionally rather than artificially. The phonemes, *r* and *l,* true *bêtes noirs* to Thai speakers, are carefully differentiated. And the students learn to speak by *speaking.* Talks are assigned. To hear an engineer describe the building of a bridge, to see a class held enthralled as a naval commander describes a thrilling ship maneuver in a typhoon, to listen to a nurse describe public health problems in colloquial and authoritative diction become regular occurrences. The teachers, native Americans, must do *all* their teaching in English. All explanations must be conveyed in the language being taught. There is no opportunity to lapse into the native tongue for exposition of any sort.

To listen to a class at the Language Center and to hear the traditional phrases and idioms of the American people coming from the lips of these eager students is to witness a true lesson in motivated teaching and apt learning.

Skill in colloquial speech and knowledge of a country's customs, mores, and literature are the "tiles and copestones" used by the A.U.A. Language Center to build the structure of a democratic world community. The Fulbright Professor, teaching American speech to his foreign students is another influence in the struggle for all-important pieces of geography.

WHAT CAN BE DONE BY TEACHERS OF SPEECH TO PRESERVE FREEDOM OF SPEECH: A SYMPOSIUM

JAMES W. PARKERSON*

with

WALDO BRADEN, GEORGE BRIAN, DONALD GRAHAM, MONROE LIPPMAN, and ROY MURPHY

Are there not indications that people throughout the world are forgetting what freedom is? Are people not afraid to speak their honest views on the questions of the day, in the face of organized opposition? Is not freedom of speech in grave danger? These are real and vital questions, which are of vital concern to teachers of speech.

Consider the play on words and abuse of language so skillfully carried on by the Communists. Consider the hours of Communist verbiage to which their speakers have subjected decent, honorable and freedom-loving men around the conference tables of the world. Are not such groups endangering freedom of speech at the international level?

Consider the national political and domestic scene. Are speakers not afraid to express their views frankly and openly in the face of strong opposition and the wielders of patronage? Also, consider the charges and counter-charges of "character assassination" seemingly hurled loosely from the many political camps.

Nor does it stop there! What about our schools? Who among us here today considers that he is completely free, in view of his position in his college and community, to speak his views on controversial issues of the day?

I have sat in board meetings in churches and civic groups when business has been "railroaded through." At times in such meetings I have witnessed what to me is a tragic event when one member rises to speak against the majority and is given the cold, icy stares of individuals with whom he would take issue.

Consider the other media of communicaton, such as the theatre, movies, radio, and television. Have not certain of our prominent

---

*Assistant Professor of Speech, Northeast Louisiana State College.

playwrights and script writers been censured for some of their writings?

Someone has said that democracy is a technique. If it is a technique — and I believe that it is — then like any technique it must be developed, and at least preserved, through the free practice and use of it.

And so, as teachers of speech who are presumably interested in promoting the proper use of speech in our democratic society, we have a special reason for considering the question: What can be done by teachers of speech to preserve freedom of speech?

Members of the Symposium

Waldo Braden is Associate Professor of Speech at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

George Brian is Assistant Professor of Speech at Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, Louisiana.

Donald Graham is an Instructor in Speech and the Director of Forensics at Northwestern State College in Nachitoches, Louisiana.

Monroe Lippman is Professor and Head of the Department of Theatre and Speech at Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Roy Murphy is Professor and Head of the Department of Speech at Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, Louisiana.

Waldo W. Braden

Senator William Fulbright recently said that the Founding Fathers "believed that our democratic society presupposes the code of the gentleman. It does not expect saintly conduct of men. It does, however expect that they should conduct themselves with a decent respect to the opinions of mankind. When . . . public men indulge themselves in abuse, when they deny others a fair trial, when they resort to innuendo and insinuation, to libel, scandal and suspicion, then our democratic society is outraged, and democracy is baffled." Implied in this statement is a premise which I feel is basic to our discussion today: Freedom in a democratic society demands self-discipline.

Admittedly we have protection against the wanton use of absolute freedom of speech. The courts have ruled against "the lewd

and obscene, the profane, the libelous, and the insulting or fighting words — those which by their utterance inflict injury or tend to incite an immediate breach of the peace." But the abuse of freedom of expression occurs in areas in which the citizen must exercise judgment as to what constitutes good taste. Freedom of speech is often placed in jeopardy by those who are unaware of or insensitive to their responsibilities. Enemies of free speech include "the boor, the liar, the lout, and the anti-democrat in general."

What does all this have to do with the teacher of speech? What part can we play in insuring the preservation of this great freedom? It seems to me that our task is to teach our students what their responsbilities are or the code of gentlemen to which Senator Fulbright referred. This means, of course, that we must be more than teachers of how-to-do-it. We must be teachers of attitudes and ethics. We need to introduce our students to a kind of Hippocratic code for speakers. Such a code might include such tenets as the following:

a. Good speaking demands broad learning and knowledge.
b. Good speaking demands thorough analysis of the immediate problem.
c. Good speaking demands an eagerness on the part of the speaker to have his listeners understand fully and completely.
d. Good speaking demands honest thinking.
e. Good speaking demands a recognition of social responsibility.

The challenge of our profession is great and awesome. Passing through our classes and activities are future voters who may have much to do with the preservation of freedom of speech. Are we developing in these students a philosophy of win-by-any-means-and-at-any-cost? Or are we making our students see that freedom entails responsibilty? Are we building citizens who are big enough to live up to their responsibilities?

George Brian

It has been said that the level of culture of a given nation of people at any given time in its history can be determined by viewing the drama it produces. At present in our own country one can observe what the general public appreciates in terms of what it demands from our stage, movies, radio and television. What the

theater-goer wants to see is the determining factor in what he gets; and, unfortunately, what he is willing to pay for determines the degree of quality on the American stage. Far too often our playwrights are restricted by a lack of interest in or an understanding of fine drama by the audiences for which they write. Because of such an indifference on the part of a large majority of people in this country, the stage is being denied its rightful freedom of expression. What can the teacher of speech do to preserve a freedom of speech through training in dramatics?

In answering such a question it seems to me that there is one thing that stands above all the rest and is the most neglected by our schools. The drama instructor should strive to build an audience for the future which can both understand and appreciate the best efforts that our stages can and should put forth.

There is, and always has been, a large number of students in our colleges and universities who are either indifferent or on the fringe of interest as far as the drama is concerned. If students such as these could be reached and encouraged to attend and enjoy plays, a genuine acceptance and liberation of the live stage could be stimulated.

Perhaps one of the most needed courses in any dramatic curriculum is that of drama appreciation. Such a course should not be designed for those students whose major interest is speech and drama, but it should meet the needs of those who want to know a little about theater-going.

The speech teacher has to answer many questions for a class in appreciation of drama. Certain scripts require a study of moral aspects, others require political criticism, and all should be discussed according to their intellectual value. An important point that cannot be overlooked in the American theater is the question of acceptance or how a play will be received socially in various communities. A course including such discussions would be invaluable to a student in journalism who will be required to interpret and criticize play production for the public.

The last paragraph from a piece entitled "I Am The Theater," written by Oliver M. Sayler, seems to summarize what has been said concerning the freedom of expression in the theater through an enlightened audience. Sayler states "But I (the theater) have never withered and I have never died, and I never will unless I am

slain by (my audience through) ignorance and greed and bigotry."

One of the important tasks a speech teacher has in dramatics is to help develop a higher type of play-goer for future progress in our theaters because it is the audience who gives the stage its widest freedom of speech.

DONALD L. GRAHAM

Teachers of speech are uniquely interested in the preservation of "freedom of speech." Since we have more than a mere professional intrest in an ideal, however, I regard it as a privilege to be invited to speak at this symposium.

My attitude in regard to the subject for discussion is this: I believe that "freedom of speech" in America faces no serious or unusual threat. Let me suggest a few ideas which constitute some support for my position. I have noticed that people have a tendency to think in terms of dramatic extremes. The fact that speakers today do not rise courageously to denounce King George III and defy the power of England, some people regard as negative evidence that we can no longer practice "freedom of speech." And because some Congressmen deplore the protective use of the Fifth Amendment while abusing "freedom of speech" under the protection of Congressional immunity, some people have become afraid that their "freedom of speech" has been slandered out of existence.

We should remember that "freedom of speech" originated in America against a background of political revolution and is practiced in an environment of political stability. The current isolated dramatic extremes do not adequately justify fear; they are simply more persuasive because of their immediacy.

"Freedom of speech" is only rarely dramatic. The basic strength of our country lies in the beliefs and practices of the non-headline citizen. Elections every two years present us with exhibits of "freedom of speech" which are sometimes as extreme as anyone could desire. Radio programs such as "Meet the Press," "Town Meeting of the Air," etc., provide examples, too, on the other side of the picture. Add: the action of the teachers of the University of California; this symposium itself; the unquestioned and encouraged intercollegiate debating of politically and economically controversial subjects. I think freedom of speech is so well established in our

national life, that we need fear little that we are being deprived of it.

Still, as teachers of speech, we are in a professional position to help preserve this ideal. In our classrooms, we may encourage the student to speak freely concerning his belief, to be responsible for the truth of his ideas, to listen respectfully to the beliefs of his classmates, and to hold them responsible for the truth of their ideas. We can encourage student government, extra-curricular activities such as debate and discussion, and work toward as much freedom as possible for our faculty colleagues. If we do all these conscientiously, we will have a strong influence on the retention of "freedom of speech."

After all, if anything may be said to perpetuate itself, it is "freedom of speech."

MONROE LIPPMAN

Freedom of speech means to me the right to discuss freely any aspect of any subject, and to express openly any opinion, however controversial or unpopular. In its relation to theatrical study and production, the subject is highly important because the theatre is best studied in terms of its political, economic and social backgrounds. The development of the theatre reflects the viewpoints and *mores* of various periods of our civiliaztion, and the theatre has often been greatly influential in its presentation of controversial subject matter. In our theatre courses, failure to treat of historical facts or contemporary viewpoints lest we upset the sensibilities of professional patriots and moralists will not change those facts or viewpoints. Refusal to study a play because of the political persuasion of its author will not affect the merit or lack of merit of that play. Banning the production of a play because it criticizes certain aspects of American life will change neither the play nor the aspects of our life under examination. Such actions can only deepen the ignorance of our students and our populace.

As for the teaching of speech, it should go without saying that in a field where the very meat of some courses comes from the free give-and-take discussion of important issues, we must demand for ourselves, and grant to others, complete freedom of speech. It is essential that there be absolute freedom of choice of speeches for

study and analysis, whether those speeches be by Eisenhower or Stevenson, Churchill or Molotov, Roosevelt or Hitler, Lincoln or McCarthy. It is necessary that we respect the right of our students, and of anyone else, to speak for or against *any* political candidate, *any* form of government, *any* form of religon, *any* school of political, social, economic, philosophical or religious thought. If freedom of speech doesn't mean that, it doesn't mean anything!

It is imperative that we be willing, when necessary, to stand up and be counted, on our own campuses and in our own communities. It is imperative that we make our students realize that not only are freedom of speech and our other great freedoms their right, but the preservation of them is their responsibility. We cannot hope to continue to enjoy the freedoms without which most of us could not easily live, unless each generation is imbued with the necessity of keeping those freedoms against all odds.

ROY D. MURPHY

Teachers of speech may contribute to the preservation of freedom of speech by inspiring and preparing students to meet certain speech responsibilities which seem to be assoicated with retaining the concept as it is traditionally understood in our society.

If freedom of speech is to survive, it must be extensively, vigorously, and effectively exercised. Speech teachers may assist in this respect by providing opportunities for students to present their views on current controversial problems. Student opinions should not be challenged by the instructor. However, suggestions may be offered regarding the manner in which students employed rules of logic and principles and techniques of speech in formulating, developing, supporting, and expressing their ideas.

Intelligence in formulating convictions should be displayed by those who advance ideas on controversial matters if freedom of speech is not to be distorted. Speech teachers can help with this problem by acquainting students with research techniques and principles of analysis. The knowledge and application of such techniques and principles should enable students to understand and defend their beliefs intelligently.

Honesty must be practiced by those who voice thoughts on controversial terms if freedom of speech is to thrive. Speech teachers

can further this virtue by encouraging students to refrain from distorting the meaning of words. Then too, students should be taught the nature of supporting materials and the principles of speech and rules of logic to be followed in handling the material with which they formulate and support contentions. Such training should discourage students from voicing naked assertions, untruths, half-truths, and it should help them to avoid sophistic reasoning.

The dishonest application of rhetorical principles must be counter-acted if freedom of speech is to flourish. Speech teachers can help by encouraging students to be critical of the speeches of others. If word meanings are distorted, if unsupported assertions are presented, if untruths and half-truths are voiced, and if fallacious reasoning is employed by a speaker, students should be taught to be skeptical of thoughts presented in such a manner. Under certain circumstances, they should be moved to actively oppose the opinions of such a speaker.

If many of the former students of speech teachers exercise freedom of speech vigorously and effectively, if they display intelligence in formulating convictions, if they practice honesty in voicing their thoughts, and if they counteract the dishonest application of rhetorical principles, it is quite possible that teachers of speech will have made a definite contribution to the preservation of freedom of speech.

BOOK REVIEWS

Edyth M. Renshaw, *Editor*

A SURVEY OF VERB FORMS IN THE EASTERN UNITED STATES, STUDIES IN AMERICAN ENGLISH 2. By Bagby E. Atwood. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1953; pp. vi + 53. $2.50.

A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States is the ninth book to be based on the vast body of data gathered by the organization of the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada.

The author examines the verbs used from Maine to Georgia at the level of what H. L. Mencken has called "the American vulgate." The book covers morphological features (with phonemic interpretations) as follows:

I. The tense forms of some thirty-six verbs, illustrating the prevalence of *blow-blowed, bring-brung, dive-dove, drown-drowned, see-have saw, write-have wrote, etc.*

II. The present indicative forms of *to be* and nine other verbs, examining, for example, *I says, I be, he don't, he do, etc.*

III. The number and concord of eight verbs, exhibiting such forms as *we was, people thinks, here's your clothes, (h)it's many people.*

IV. Negative forms of the order of *(h)ain't* I? (for both *am* and *have*), *it wasn't me, he hadn't* (or *didn't*)*ought.*

V. The infinitives and participles of four verbs, covering *for to tell, singin', a-laughin(g), gwine, etc.*

VI. The phrases *might could, belongs to be* and *like to fell,* with their variations.

Atwood's discussion material in the book is illustrated by 31 full-page maps. The discussions are *scholarly,* direct, lucid, and completely free of exhibitionism and dogmatism. Atwood's symbolism conforms to IPA, with no deviations of personal inventiveness or cultish desire to keep up with the neo-linguistic Joneses. His conclusions are based on demonstrable facts, never on a desire to project a favorite theory on sparse or preliminary data.

Atwood finds that as to certain verb forms there is no entirely uniform grammar of the American vulgate. Instead, there "is a variety of regional dialects, each with its own set of grammatical forms." *As tall as I be* does not wander materially from the northern Atlantic area, nor *Is I going, holp,* and *might could* from the southern. As to other forms, such as *ketched,* there is wide distribution all the way from north to south.

Those interested in the boundaries of dialect areas in the East will note that Atwood's isoglosses, based on verb forms, largely confirm Kurath's isoglosses based on vocabulary. That is, "There are forms characteristic of the North (the New England settlements), the Midland (the Pennsylvania settlements), and the South (the plantation country)." It now remains to be determined how nearly the pronunciation distributions conform to Kurath's lexical and Atwood's morphological distributions.

Atwood's calm, methodical scholarship permits of little serious questioning. One may ask, to be sure, why, when the choice has been made to represent phonemically with /r/ all verbs containing historic postvocalic *r (e.g.,* /worn/ for both [wcrn] and [wcn]), the pattern should be reversed by representing *burst* as /best/ for both [best] and [best], without the /r/. And considering

the widely accepted validity of Kurath's statement in *Word Geography* that Negro speech "exhibits the same regional and local variations as that of the simple white folk," the reason for Atwood's distinguishing between Negro and white pronunciations does not immediately appear.

But such items are of minor import when measured against the solid values of the book as a whole. *Eastern Verb Forms* will at once become a standard reference in its field.

C. M. Wise

Louisiana State University

RADIO ENGLISH. By Florence Felton French, William B. Levenson, and Vera Cober Rockwell. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952; pp. xiii + 368. $3.60.

Radio English is a simply planned high school textbook, written in the concise, terse style of a directive. Collaborating here are an English teacher, a speech teacher — both of whom are playwrights —, and a directing supervisor of radio in a large public school system. These authors recognize the limits established by the oral-aural demands of radio communication. They present a clearly motivated sequence of instructions and supplementary drills to direct with equal facility the sponsor of the extra-curricular radio workshop and the experienced teacher of radio.

Writing, directing, and performing are proportionately stressed in *Radio English*. In the first three sections of the book are instructions for writing and presenting continuity, news, talks, interviews, and discussions in various forms. Without theorizing on what makes a good talk, a successful discussion, or a well-built news story, the authors present clear directions for using the medium of radio to reach specific audiences with effective talks, effective discussions, and worthwhile news programs. Section Four discusses the radio play, first from the point of view of the director, then from the point of view of the writer. For the director, the text outlines the procedures he must follow in blending dialogue, sound, and music into a unified production. For the writer there are instructions equally specific in the use of the same elements. A final section introduces television programming, acting and production. Appendices contain one 15-minute radio script and a useful glossary of radio and television terminology.

The discussion of voice training and pronunciation is basically sound. Excellent exercises are recommended. The inclusion of phonetics, on the other hand, is superficial. For example, the authors introduce the schwa sound (and symbol) to indicate unstressings in oral style. The schwa sound, they write, "is short, often called the *weak* form when substituted for another vowel of a stronger form. Sometimes the schwa is the first vowel sound, as in the words *alone, perchance,* and *purport*. Again it may be the second vowel sound, as in the words *sofa, suffer,* and *circus*. . . ." Questions will arise in the minds of alert users of the textbook when they try to fit the same vowel sound into the syllable *a* in *alone* and *per* in *perchance;* likewise in trying to reconcile the final vowel sounds *a* in *sofa* and *er* in *suffer*. The authors of *Radio English* introduce no other phonetic symbols.

On the whole *Radio English* exemplifies the authority and know-how of its

writers. The book will prove itself as a reliable aid to the secondary school radio workshop director — indeed, to the workshop for beginners in radio regardless of their graded level.

CLINTON BRADFORD

Louisiana State University

DISCUSSION AND DEBATE. By Henry Ewbank and Jeffrey Auer. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951; pp. ix-492. $3.75.

According to the Table of Contents this book is divided into five parts: a point of view, the problem, the listener, discussion, debate. The first section of the book deals primarily with the basic principles of argumentation, such as the discussion of evidence, argument, fallacies, and research, which are so vital as the groundwork for discussion and debate. The last section of the book is devoted to the discussion of the technique of discussion and debate.

The discussion of the principles of argumentation is based on the five steps in problem-solving. There is a chapter each on techniques of research, preliminary analysis, evidence, argument and fallacies under the first and second phases of problem-solving. Chapters on examining suggested solutions and choosing the best solution complete the chapters which form the foundation for the later explanation of discussion and debate.

Seven chapters deal with discussion and discussion techniques. The authors spend more time revealing the different types of discussion than in giving some of the desired information about the duties of the chairman and the discussion participants.

Five chapters are devoted to debate. The techniques of debate are clearly presented with many helpful suggestions for the preparation of rebuttal speeches.

Two outstanding chapters in my opinion are Chapter III, "How Individuals Think," and Chapter XII, "How Individuals in Groups Think." The chief purpose of both discussion and debate is problem-solving. No matter how we examine this or rephrase it, the statement means we are trying to get people to think or act as we wish. These chapters make us realize how to accomplish this end more efficiently.

This text could be used for any of three courses: principles of argumentation, discussion, and/or debate. The presentation of the material is clear and interesting.

EVELYN KEMPE

Memphis State College

PROBLEMS OF OPERA PRODUCTION. By Walter R. Volbach. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1953; pp. xii + 196. $4.00.

The sharp upsurge of interest in opera in this country has caused the publication of a number of articles and a few books designed to assist the comparative tyro who undertakes the not inconsiderable task of staging an opera. Since the basic problems of opera production are similar everywhere and are principally affected by the facilities and personnel available, any book

on the subject must contain certain pertinent material. Dr. Volbach's is no exception and it would be unrealistic to expect to find anything strikingly new in this text. The historical background, the importance of opera for the community, questions of style, staging and direction are all treated in a sound manner. There are valuable suggestions as to the functions and attitudes of all concerned with the production; the singers, the conductor, the stage director, the orchestra and chorus. Dr. Volbach has had much practical experience and those who have not accumulated the knowledge that is derived from actual participation will do well to give his words full weight.

A number of operas are given special attention and the book is illustrated with photographs of productions, some of them of high quality and some that are rather ordinary in conception. A large number of the illustrations, while very interesting to see, are of settings somewhat beyond the range of any but professional opera companies. There are floor plans showing how settings and properties may be arranged to facilitate rather than obstruct the movement of the characters. Space does not permit a detailed outline of the contents but it can be said, without reservation, that there is much in this book that would be helpful to the non-professional participant in an opera production. It is doubtful that the author meant it to go farther than that, as there would be little point in writing a book of this nature for the person of wide experience.

Harrison Kerr

University of Oklahoma

THE NATURE OF ROMAN COMEDY. By George E. Duckworth. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952; pp. xiii + 501. $7.50.

Beare, in his recent volume on the Roman theatre, has pointed out that nearly all discussions of Latin drama have rested on certain assumptions which are incapable of proof. George Duckworth has avoided this danger by basing his remarkably thorough study of Roman comedy on the fairly substantial ground of the twenty-six extant plays of Plautus and Terence.

The introductory chapters deal with the literary and theatrical developments leading to Roman comedy — the Fescennine verses, the *satura,* the *fabula Atellana,* the *mime* and the New Comedy of Menander. Unlike Nicoll and Bieber, he does not place much emphasis on the Sicilian burlesques or the *phlyakes.* Then, by incorporating his own careful analysis with the research of other reputable scholars, Duckworth provides a comprehensive study of Roman comedy as seen primarily in the plays of Plautus and Terense. Although the emphasis is placed on the dramaturgical ingredients of the plays, such as theme, plot, methods of composition, foreshadowing, suspense and characterization, the author does not neglect the elements of the physical theatre — methods of staging, stage conventions and other theatrical techniques of the time. Duckworth states that since he is dealing with a period marked by theatrical rather than literary achievements, classical students interested in drama must visualize the production on the stage and avoid using only the test of strict laws of composition, for the very essence of their being is their popular entertainment value.

Such modern survivals of Roman comedy as Giraudoux's *Amphitryon 38* and the Rodgers and Hart musical comedy, *The Boys from Syracuse* remind

one that a study of Roman comedy is also valuable for those interested in the writing and producing of all the various forms of modern popular entertainment including farce, musical comedy, vaudeville, the movies, radio and television comedies.

Dr. Duckworth's full treatment of so many facets of the writing and production of Roman comedy, although it bears out the accepted idea of Roman comedy as being somewhat stratified and dogmatic, results in a thoroughly readable and instructive source for an understanding of the intent of Roman comedy for its time and the significance which it has had for comedy in many western nations during the past five centuries.

An excellent bibliography arranged under chapter headings and a comprehensive index add to the value of the volume for reference purposes.

Delwin B. Dusenbury

University of Florida

DIAGNOSTIC MANUAL IN SPEECH CORRECTION. By Wendell Johnson, Frederic L. Darley, and D. C. Spriestersbach. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952; pp. viii + 221. $2.50.

A CASE BOOK IN SPEECH THERAPY. By C. Van Riper. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1953; pp. 141. $2.75.

The workbook by Johnson, Darley, and Spriestersbach fills a long-felt need for a comprehensive, authoritative manual for use in training professional workers in diagnostic procedures for speech correction. Fortunately, its use is not restricted to a particular textbook, and its organization is especially adaptable to courses in clinical practice. Because of the nature of the material included, the workbook will be a boon to practicing speech therapists and workers in related fields as well as to training institutions.

The manual is divided into twenty-two units and has ten sections in the Appendix. Interviewing techniques, preparation of case histories, examination for and measurement of speech involvements, and analysis of various developmental factors are covered. The plan for the units includes explanation of diagnostic procedures, reference material, forms for recording information, and assignments.

The procedures and forms outlined in this manual have been developed through the years at the University of Iowa and are based on research to date.

Van Riper's Case Book makes a unique contribution to speech therapy literature, presenting as it does a complete case study, emphasizing the problems of the habilitation process encountered in a speech clinic. The book aims to train clinicians and classroom teachers in problem-solving techniques in speech correction.

The book is essentially in workbook form, with pages perforated for removal. A case is presented in detail from the time of referral to dismissal. Included are correspondence of clinic with parents and school; reports of diagnostic and examination procedures, of interviews with parents and teachers, and of therapy sessions; lesson plans; and notes from director, supervisor, and clinician. At appropriate points, the problems faced by the various workers are analyzed, and a multiple choice of solutions is presented to the reader.

The book makes exceedingly interesting reading and will be useful in speech correction courses preceding clinical practice. For those curious ones, it should be reported that no answer book is attached.

KATHLEEN VARNER

Texas State College for Women

POETRY, RELIGION AND THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. By George F. Thomas. Houston: The Elzevier Press, 1951; pp. ix + 113. $2.00.

The essays in this volume were first presented under the sponsorship of The Rockwell Lectures at Rice Institute in Houston. Dr. Thomas, of the Princeton Philosophy Department (formerly of Southern Methodist, Dartmouth, and the University of North Carolina), continues here his penetrating analysis of the philosophy of spirit in contemporary life, a study which he began in his *Spirit and Its Freedom* and has continued during the past fifteen years in essays and lectures.

In the first section of this volume there is a detailed study of the nature of the spiritual life; major conceptions of the spiritual life in Western thought are evaluated in terms of the intellectual, aesthetic, moral and religious ideas which have most deeply influenced this thought. Through this analysis the writer seeks to establish a spiritual basis for the enrichment of our contemporary living. This he finds in Christian Humanism, which calls for the fullest development of the intellectual and aesthetic interests of the individual as well as service to his fellows through moral conduct. The remaining two sections trace the contributions of poetry and religion to the expressions of spiritual life. The essays on "The Nature of Imagination" and "The Religious Imagination" are particularly rewarding.

While this volume is not directly related to the speech field, teachers of speech and interpretation will find much here that might profitably be applied to their teaching.

DAVID RUSSELL

Southern Methodist University

EXCURSIONS INTO PRACTICAL COMPOSITION. Made available by Garland Greever. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1952. pp. xvi + 377. $2.50.

The title page tells us that the "Excursions" are "Conducted by Various Writers and Made Available to Students by Garland Greever." Students should be grateful to Mr. Greever for making the excursions such pleasant experiences. This book would seem to be more "Practical" than most in aiding the relatively uninitiated college freshman to achieve competence in his everyday writing.

The organization of material appears to be reasonable and logical; the emphasis, as reflected in the amount of space devoted to various items, seems well-placed. Part One treats "Functional Writing — Communication." Of the 226 pages assigned to this subject, only 23 are the usual "textbook" treatment, the remaining two hundred consisting of widely varied illustrative

selections, varied as to authorship, quality of writing, and subject matter. This variety should enhance student appeal, and certainly the quality of some selections should stimulate at least the better students into saying, "I can do that well myself." The many "Suggested Topics" for practice, carefully placed at the end of each selection should likewise prove stimulating. Seventy-five pages are devoted to Part Two, "Skillful Writing — Technique," of which ten are "text." The selections in this portion are more challenging, being taken for the most part from standard literature. They seem to have been carefully selected, each for a specific purpose, and they illustrate these with conciseness and brevity. Moving further up the ladder of difficulty in effective writing, Part Three deals with "Imaginative Writing — Art." The same method and approach are used here.

Altogether this book has much to commend itself to the teacher of freshman classes in English or Communication Skills. Teachers of Speech will be interested in selections relating to their field from S. I. Hayakawa, George Herbert Palmer, Sarett and Foster, James Russell Lowell and Mark Twain.

P. Merville Larson

Texas Technological College

INTERPRETATIVE SPEECH. By Lionel Crocker. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952; pp. viii + 358. $4.25.

Mr. Crocker, author of a number of text books in the field of speech, has come up with another new idea in this latest text on interpretation. It is a sound idea in many respects. The plan of the book is based, not on chapters, but on a series of thirty "lessons," each covering one aspect of theory, together with some practice material. There is a brief anthology of readings, both prose and poetry, and an excellent bibliography.

This lesson format, while containing nothing new, since the material covered is usually included in most interpretation texts, does have the advantage of giving the student no more than he can digest at one time. The lessons may be approached in any order the instructor desires. The material in the anthology, while covering only 59 pages, is refreshingly different and tastefully selected.

The plan of the book may have one fault, which the author himself points out in the preface, where he states: "This organization may make the theory appear fragmentary and repetitious but the advantages outweigh the disadvantages." One can but hope the latter part of the statement is true. This reviewer has no quarrel with repetition, but he is afraid that some of the theory *is* fragmentary. For example, to the discussion of imagery, the author devotes exactly 92 lines. Mood, atmosphere, and attitude are treated in about four pages. Nevertheless, getting thirty elements of interpretative theory, plus illustrative readings, into 265 pages, is no mean feat.

Every serious student of interpretation will want to own a copy of this book.

Angus Springer

Southwestern University

NEWS AND NOTES

CHLOE ARMSTRONG, *Editor*

The Texas Educational Theatre Association held its annual conference at Arlington State College, March 13-14. Syllabi were completed for one-semester courses in acting and technical production. Mimeographed copies are being reproduced and will be distributed to Texas junior and senior colleges shortly. The syllabus for *Introduction to the Theatre* was prepared and distributed last year.

Eighteen colleges and universities were represented at the Arlington conference. James Barton, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, was elected president for 1954-55, and Richard Slaughter, Arlington College, was re-elected secretary. This no-dues organization was established to give Texas educational theatre teachers an opportunity to discuss and solve problems of mutual interest. Any teacher of theatre or community theatre director is welcomed at the annual meetings.

Next year's conference will meet at Texas A & M, Feb. 12-13. The project for the year involves stage and theatre construction and equipment. The usual informal, round-table type of discussion on this subject will take place at the conference, and the results will be mimeographed and sent to Texas theatre teachers, architects, and administrators.

* * *

Miss Thelma Goodwin, Department of Speech of State Teachers College, Troy, Alabama, announces that the Troy State Playmakers made their annual tour of schools in southeastern Alabama this past spring. This marks the sixth year that the Playmakers have made the tour. The production for this year was *Blythe Spirit.*

* * *

Dr. Elton Abernathy, Chairman of the Department of Speech at Southwest Texas State Teachers College, announces that Dr. Harold Westlake and Dr. Giles W. Gray will each spend a week on the campus this summer. Dr. Westlake will conduct a special workshop in Speech Pathology, and Dr. Gray will participate in the annual Speech Skills Workshop for high school teachers and students.

Mrs. Jo Wayland Bennett will return to the speech staff next September after a two-year leave of absence because of the birth of a son.

The spring dramatic production was *Medea,* adapted by Robinson Jeffers.

* * *

The University of Houston will offer its second annual summer institute for high school students from July 19-30. Classes in Acting, Beginning Debate, Advanced Debate, Individual Events, and Radio-TV will be offered in the morning of each day of the institute. Afternoons and evenings will be spent in recreation and study. Swimming parties, boat trips, tours, picnics, attendance at plays, etc., have been planned.

The Speech Workshop will be conducted from June 7 to July 17. Eight members of the faculty will present lectures, demonstrations, and discussions on the problems of teaching speech.

The Drama Workshop will be offered during both summer sessions and will give the student practical experience in directing, acting, and technical theatre. Opportunity will be made available to work on four productions that will be presented during the summer.

The TV workshop will be offered both summer sessions and will cover techniques of staging, producing, acting, and directing TV shows. In addition to the workshops, the following special courses will be offered of interest to teachers:

Special drama courses in directing, acting, and technical theatre.
Special speech correction courses in speech and hearing therapy.
Special radio courses and television courses in production and directing.

* * *

Floyd L. Sandle, Director of Dramatics at Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana, announces that the two major productions this year were *Come Back, Little Sheba* and *Take Care of My Little Girl.* Mr. Sandle also directed *The Little Minister* for the Shreveport Community Theatre Guild.

* * *

Charles A. Schmidt, Acting Director of the Speech Department at Sam Houston State Teachers College, has announced the appointment of Mrs. Joan C. Vandorhoff as a part-time instructor. Mrs. Vanderhoff is a graduate of Utah State College.

The spring production of the Drama Department included *The Philadelphia Story* and *The Diamond Jubilee Pageant.*

* * *

Miss Norma Jean Ballard, Speech Instructor and Debate Coach of Southern Methodist University, became the bride of Mr. Elbert Stanton in a double wedding ceremony shared by her sister, Miss Virginia Lee Ballard, who married Mr. Gene Lewis. The date was February 27.

Miss Peggy Harrison, Director of the Speech Clinic, has been on a leave of absence for the past year working toward a Ph.D. at the University of Southern California.

David Russell, Assistant Professor of Speech and Theatre, was recently elected vice-president of the Southwest Theatre Conference.

The Arden Club of Southern Methodist University departed from tradition for its fourth production of the current season by: (1) producing a religious drama in connection with Religious Emphasis Week; (2) utilizing off-campus facilities for the production. *A Sleep of Prisoners,* by Christopher Fry, was the play. It was directed by Dr. Edyth Renshaw; technical direction was by Vern Reynolds. It was played in the Highland Park Presbyterian Church sanctuary, February 18, 19, and 20 to an audience of approximately 2,500.

* * *

A number of original scripts have been produced by the Department of Drama at the University of Texas this year. Five short plays, written by playwriting majors under the supervision of Dr. E. P. Conkle, were staged by graduate drama students during the first semester. *The First Step Up* by Jean Browne, *The Trumpet* by Charles Taylor, *The Muddled Magician* by William Crain, *Everybody Is a Lonely Man* by David Hanig, and *Out of the Thunder* by Jac Farmer were presented. *Heaven Is a Place,* Jean Browne's original long play, was produced the second semester by a graduate drama student as his MFA thesis production.

The University of Texas Department of Drama production schedule for the second semester included ***Country Girl,*** directed by James Moll; ***The Dance Drama,*** staged by Shirlee Dodge; ***The Mikado,*** produced in conjunction with the music department and staged by Dr. Francis Hodge; ***Finian's Rainbow;*** and ***A Midsummer Night's Dream*** which was directed by B. Iden Payne, noted Shakespearean authority.

Mrs. Marion McMichael has been added to the staff of the Department of Drama at the University of Texas as an Assistant Professor of Acting. Mrs. McMichael has had a great deal of professional experience coaching and training actors in the professional theatre and in the motion picture industry. She comes to the department from Highlands University in New Mexico.

Miss Carol Stone, Broadway and Hollywood actress and daughter of Fred Stone, was a visiting lecturer in acting during the second semester at the University of Texas Department of Drama. Miss Stone coached students and acted with them in laboratory scenes which were a part of the regularly scheduled acting courses.

The Department of Drama at the University of Texas will expand its summer production program this year. At least three plays will be produced during the first semester of the 1954 session. A regular schedule of graduate and undergraduate theatre courses will also be offered.

* * *

The Classic Players of Bob Jones University presented ***Hamlet*** as their spring production. Dr. Bob Jones, Jr., President of the University, took the leading role.

As part of the students' extra-curricular activities, a weekly vesper program is sponsored by the speech and music departments.

* * *

The Department of Radio and Television of the University of Alabama is pleased to announce the establishment of student television station WABP-TV as an addition to the operation of student radio station WABP in service to the campus community.

* * *

Dr. Lola Walker of the Baylor University Department of Speech and Radio plans to spend the summer visiting in England. She will make her headquarters at the home of her cousins, Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Throsby, Lindridge, 79 Shanklin Drive, Leicester, England. From there she plans to visit Edinburgh, the Lake District in Scotland, Ireland, Shakespeare's home, and other places of interest in England.

* * *

The Texas Christian University Little Theatre will produce five three-act plays during the twelve-week summer term. This is to be an interesting experiment in community-educational theatre. A Board of Advisors determines the general policies of the theatre and is composed of representatives of the Ft. Worth Theatre Council, civic organizations, and Texas Christian University. Actors and technicians will be both university students and townspeople interested in theatre.

The 1953-54 Texas Christian University Little Theatre has included five productions: ***The Enchanted, The Millionnairess, Cup of Fury*** (an original), ***Charley's Aunt,*** and ***An Evening of One-Acts.*** The Children's Theatre gave ***Wizard of Oz*** as a major production.

The second annual high school one-act play clinic was held at Texas Christian University on February 27, 1954. Prof. Charles Suggs of the Drama Department, University of Oklahoma, served as critic judge. Eight schools were in attendance: Grapevine, Weatherford, Birdville, Granbury, Adamson, Decatur, Stephen F. Austin, and Breckenridge.

Texas Christian University will again run its two-weeks Summer Workshop in Speech-Drama-Radio for high school students from June 7 to June 19.

Mrs. Dorothy Bell, Director of the Texas Christian University Speech Clinic, has organized the mothers of children in the clinic into a formal class in hearing therapy.

On February 27 the sixth annual KFJZ Radio Scholarship Award contest for high school seniors was held at Texas Christian University. Each year Radio KFJZ of Ft. Worth gives six $150 scholarships to high school seniors who show superior radio potential and who desire to attend Texas Christian University and major in radio. Mr. Gene Cagle, Manager of the Texas State Network, originated the award in 1948.

* * * *

Dr. Howard W. Townsend, editor of THE SOUTHERN SPEECH JOURNAL served as consultant and instructor in speech for the fifth annual Texas Butane Dealers Association Management Institute held at the Buccaneer Hotel in Galveston, April 12-15. He will serve in the same capacity for the annual Texas Retail Merchants Association Institute in August at the Driskill Hotel in Austin.

A presentation dinner honoring the late Edward DuBois Shurter was held in the Queen Ann Room of the Texas Union at The University of Texas, May 6. This was the occasion for the presentation to The University of Texas and the Speech Department by Mrs. E. D. Shurter through her administrator, Robert J. Albertson, an oil portrait of Professor Shurter which will hang in the Main Building, a bronze plaque which will be in the Speech Building, and a library of over four hundred volumes which will be placed in the main library. Dr. Shurter was Chairman of the Speech Department at The University of Texas from 1899 to 1923. He founded the University Interscholastic League in 1910, and was Director of Extension from 1912 until 1920.

* * * *

Officers of The Southern Speech Association elected at the annual convention in Dallas, Texas in April of this year are:

Louise D. Davison, Davison School of Speech Correction,
Atlanta, Georgia .... President
Frank B. Davis, Alabama Polytechnic Institute,
Auburn, Alabama .... First Vice-President
Freda Kenner, Messick High School, Memphis, Tennessee .... Second Vice-President
P. Merville Larson, Texas Technological College
Lubbock, Texas .... Third Vice-President
Paul Brandes, Missisippi Southern College,
Hattiesburg, Mississippi .... Advertising Manager
Douglas Ehninger, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida .... Editor
Delwin Dusenbury (continuing in office), University of Florida,
Gainesville, Florida .... Executive Secretary

INDEX

THE SOUTHERN SPEECH JOURNAL

VOLUME XIX